FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 039

27 February 1987

USSR INERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Spokesmen Comment on Semipalatinsk Nuclear Test AA 1
PRAVDA Cited on Cessation of Nuclear Moratorium AA 2
  Nazarkin Geneva Statement AA 3
Unchanged U.S. Stance on Nuclear Testing Noted [Fedyachin] AA 3
Ponomarev Decries U.S. Undermining of ABM Treaty AA 4
Chernyshev Criticizes Kissinger NEWSWEEK Article AA 5

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

TV Panel on International Peace, Security Issues [Seyful-Mulyukov, Vinogradov, Kapitsa, Amelko, Ovchinnikov] CC 1
Gromyko Meets UN Scientists, Answers Questions [IZVESTIYA 18 Feb] CC 17

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Reagan Receives Tower Commission 'Irangate' Report A 1
Senate Committee Votes To Ban Contras Aid 19 Feb [Gan in PRAVDA 20 Feb] A 1
TASS Comments on U.S. Maneuvers in Honduras [Zagorskiy] A 2
Turkatenko: Shamir Visit Aims To Bolster U.S. A 2
Commentary Criticizes U.S. Human Rights Report [Sobolev] A 4

SOUTH ASIA

7th Round of Afghan-Pakistan Geneva Talks Open D 1
  Najibullah TV Speech D 1
  Wakil Interviewed D 2
  Falin Interviewed [Vienna] D 3
Afghan Army Spokesman on Cease-Fire Observance D 3
Najibullah Addresses Soviet Anniversary Meeting D 4

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Grossu Delegation Ends Mozambique Visit [PRAVDA 19 Feb] H 1
Egypt's Ghali Receives Visiting USSR Delegation [IZVESTIYA 22 Feb] H 1
Geyvandov Ponders Lebanese Events, U.S. Reaction [IZVESTIYA 22 Feb] H 1

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Ethiopian Defense Minister To Visit in March J 1
S. African Government-ANC Relations Viewed [Valentinov] J 1
African Petroleum Producers Association Founded [Yermachenkov in IZVESTIYA 10 Feb] J 2
Demichev Receives Jamaican Envoy, Holds Talks [IZVESTIYA 11 Feb] J 2

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Ortega Rally Address on U.S. 'Aggressive' Policy K 1
El Salvador U.S. 'Puppet,' 'Antipeople' Regime [Petrukhin in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Feb] K 1
Further Reportage on Komplektov 9-10 Feb Meeting [IZVESTIYA 12 Feb] K 3

USSR NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Gorbachev Addresses 18th AUCCTU Congress R 1
Feared Disturbances Cancel Art Show Activities [Andreyev in MOSCOW NEWS 1-8 Feb] R 15
Health Ministry Official on Drug Abuse Statistics [Vienna DIE PRESSE 20 Feb] R 17
Briefs: Presidium Red Banner Award R 17

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Forum Debates Election of Economic Cadres [Telen, Tsvetkov in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 17 Feb] S 1

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Views Tajik Food Problems [IZVESTIYA 19 Feb] T 1

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Cosmos-1824 Launched 26 Feb, Functioning 'Normally' U 1
Urals Branch of the Academy of Sciences Opens U 1

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Further Reportage of Army, Navy Day Observance V 1
    Akhromeyev on Restructuring [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Feb] V 1
    Marshal Kulikov Interviewed [TRUD 22 Feb] V 4
    Bogachev on U.S. Bases in W. Europe, Asia V 7

SPOKESMEN COMMENT ON SEMIPALATINSK NUCLEAR TEST

LD261228 Moscow TASS in English 1218 GMT 26 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 26 TASS -- Major-General Geliy Batenin, a spokesman for the USSR Defense Ministry, made a statement today at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists at the press centre of the USSR Foreign Ministry. He said:

The Soviet Union today had to explode its first nuclear device after more than 18 months of silence at its testing ranges. The step could not have come as a surprise to anybody because the Soviet Union had declared openly way back on December 18 last year that it would not be able to observe unilateral restraint in that matter for ever.

It is most regrettable that the incumbent U.S. Administration, on which it depended whether the moratorium would be extended and become bilateral, has found it impossible to press on with its nuclear testing programme and already carried out two nuclear blasts this year. [sentence as received] [Moscow TRUD in Russian 27 February p 8 publishes a TASS report headed "Briefing at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center" based on statements made at the 26 January briefing by USSR Defense Ministry spokesman Major General G.V. Batenin and G.I. Gerasimov, USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration Chief. For the sentence above, the TRUD version uses the wording: has found it possible to. Other TRUD variations appear in editorial notations below.] It thus fully ignored world public demands contained in the resolution of the U.S. General Assembly, the call of the Nonaligned Movement, the proposals of the leaders of the Delhi Six, the opinions of parliaments and the world public. Washington's irresponsible policy has placed us before [as received] the need to terminate the unilateral moratorium. A historic chance for ending nuclear tests once and for all has been missed at this stage.

The first nuclear explosion was announced today in a TASS report. It was set off at the testing range in the area of Semipalatinsk. Its yield was under 20 kilotons. The aim was to test results of research in the field of nuclear explosion physics. [The TRUD version omits the preceding two sentences.] I want to stress once more that the termination of the moratorium was a forced measure dictated by security interests only. In its test programme the Soviet Union will proceed exclusively from a minimum which is needed for fundamental research, for the aims of the national economy, for testing technical facilities and armaments for their resistance to hitting factors of a nuclear explosion, including resistance to means which are being developed under the American SDI programme. In doing so the Soviet Union has no intention of copying the nuclear programme of the USA which is aimed at developing new types of armaments, including those within the SDI framework.

Only a minimum number of tests will be held with the purpose of developing munitions for maintaining strategic parity with the USA as regards nuclear armaments. The resumption of nuclear explosions by the Soviet Union does not mean that it has abandoned its resolute struggle for the complete cessation of such tests. Our principled attitude to the task of banning nuclear tests remains unchanged: We continue to regard its solution as a top-priority measure on the way to scaling down nuclear armaments and their subsequent complete elimination, and we shall support the efforts of all states going in this direction. All the Soviet proposals for ending nuclear tests remain in force. To solve the problem of a comprehensive nuclear test ban without delay we suggest beginning full-scale talks which the USSR is ready to conduct in any composition and at any forum but, of course, with the participation of the USA. In the process of such talks it would be possible to reach agreement also on a stage-by-stage solution of this task, having in view ratification of the Soviet-American treaties of 1974 and 1976, the imposition of intermediate limitations on the number and yield of nuclear explosions. [paragraph continues]

We are leaving the door open also on the question of the moratorium. The Soviet Union is ready to get back to it any day and month when the United States announces termination of its nuclear tests. Despite all this we do not lose hope that Washington will heed the calls of the world community and reconsider its destructive attitude to this problem.

The Soviet Union will not miss a single opportunity for stepping up international efforts in the matter of banning nuclear tests. It is convinced that its position on this issue will meet with appropriate understanding and support from all peace forces of our planet. [The TRUD version omits the last sentence in this paragraph. It then publishes the statement by Gerasimov which is identical to the TASS item as published in the Arms Control & Disarmament section of the 26 February Soviet Union DAILY REPORT on pp AA1, AA2 except for omitting the sentence in paragraph four, lines twelve through fifteen: "The U.S. 'broad' interpretation, if employed, would remove all restrictions on the creation [sozdaniye] of space antimissile defense, emasculate the treaty's essence, and wreck the process of nuclear arms limitation."]

PRAVDA CITED ON CESSATION OF NUCLEAR MORATORIUM

LD270358 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2237 GMT 26 Feb 87

["On Nuclear Test in the USSR" -- TASS headline; quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow, 27 Feb (TASS) -- "There can be no doubt that the report about our underground nuclear test will bring forth considerable reaction and comment in the world," 'PRAVDA' writes today. "And, of course, it will not all be unequivocal, just as the approach of various circles and various individuals has not been unequivocal to the fact that over a period of more than a year and a half -- or to be precise, 17 and 1/2 months -- the Soviet Union has scrupulously adhered to its moratorium on any kind of nuclear explosion.

Naturally, this could not go on forever unless the U.S. side also joined in this good deed. Moscow has more than once called upon Washington to end its explosions in Nevada, to make the moratorium a joint one, and thus to take a practical step toward ending the arms race.

Demonstrating restraint and patience in the interests of a noble objective, the Soviet Union has on five occasions extended its unilateral moratorium. This has been welcomed by all the peoples who have justifiably seen in our country's peace-loving action a real opportunity to end the arms race, but also to create a change for the better in the international atmosphere, both morally and psychologically.

But while gophers and jerboas have been safely roaming through the overgrown steppe grasses of the Soviet nuclear testing grounds, the earth of Nevada has been distended by more and more bubbles of nuclear explosions. And even when the Soviet Union announced its forced decision to resume tests after the first nuclear explosion in 1987, Washington was in a hurry to carry out two tests at once -- one after the other -- as if to demonstrate its arrogant attitude to the will and aspirations of hundreds of millions of people on the planet.

Hardly any of the paid Western propagandists can recall that during the time silence reigned over our testing grounds, the United States exploded 26 nuclear devices. But we can't forget this, nor do we have the right. Our country has no other choice than to do everything necessary to reliably ensure its own security and the security of our friends and allies.

So, others are asking, does this mean that peace again finds itself up a blind alley? No, it doesn't. We are keeping, and will continue to keep, open all doors to any honest steps toward limiting and reducing armaments, toward ensuring the reliable monitoring of this process, and toward strengthening international mutual security. We say again: ending nuclear tests is a command of the times. If the United States ends its nuclear tests, the USSR will be prepared on any day and in any month on the basis of reciprocity to halt the implementation of its own program of such tests," 'PRAVDA' writes.

Nazarkin Geneva Statement

LD261729 Moscow TASS in English 1726 GMT 26 Feb 87

[Text] Geneva February 26 TASS -- In connection with the underground nuclear explosion in the Soviet Union this morning, the Soviet delegation made a statement at the plenary meeting of the conference in disarmament.

The head of the USSR delegation Yuriy Nazarkin emphasized that the resumption of tests had been an enforced measure resulting from the refusal of the U.S. side to join in the Soviet moratorium, to reach arrangement on banning nuclear weapon tests. The real reason behind this refusal is that the United States openly banks on the achievement of military superiority over the USSR, over socialist countries by creating new kinds of armaments, also in the framework of the SDI programme.

Despite this, the Soviet Union continues viewing complete banning of nuclear weapons tests as a priority measure toward curtailing nuclear armaments and their subsequent elimination. Recalling Mikhail Gorbachev's message to the leaders of the "Delhi Six" in connection with their declaration at the end of 1986, Yuriy Nazarkin stressed that the USSR as ever declares for the beginning of full scale talks on the problem of ending explosions and proposes to start without delay practical work at the conference on disarmament. The USSR representative said again that if the United States stops nuclear testing the USSR will be prepared, on the basis of reciprocity, to stop the implementation of its programme of such tests any day and any month.

UNCHANGED U.S. STANCE ON NUCLEAR TESTING NOTED

LD270332 Moscow TASS in English 2354 GMT 26 Feb 87

[Text] Washington February 27 TASS -- TASS correspondent Andrey Fedyachin reports:

It follows from a statement made by John Lehman, U.S. secretary of the Navy, at a press conference in the Pentagon that the United States has no intention of renouncing nuclear testing and will continue its test program in spite of the demands of the world and American public and the Soviet proposals for a total nuclear test ban.

Our stand on nuclear test explosions has not changed, he stressed as he argued that the U.S. stand was explained by the need to secure the effectiveness of the American nuclear arms arsenals until a defense system not based on nuclear weapons was developed. Flying in the face of facts, Lehman claimed that a moratorium on nuclear testing did not meet U.S. national security interests and posed a threat to U.S. allies. Meanwhile, it is common knowledge that the main goal of U.S. nuclear testing is the development of nuclear weapons of new types and armaments under the "Star Wars" program, specifically, laser weapons.

PONOMAREV DECRIES U.S. UNDERMINING OF ABM TREATY

LD261835 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1715 GMT 26 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow, 26 Feb (TASS) -- TASS observer Leonid Ponomarev writes:

It has long been observed that a man on the path to Hell will always look for a fellow traveller. In this sense, the trip by representatives of the U.S. Administration Paul Nitze, Edward Rowny, and Richard Perle through West Europe, Asia, and the Pacific pursues precisely this aim: to find themselves fellow travellers on the path to Star Wars, being convinced that the Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty, which has to date served as a reliable barrier to sliding towards nuclear catastrophe, is unnecessary. The Reagan administration intends to disguise the launching of weapons, including nuclear weapons, into space by its so-called "broad interpretation" of the existing ABM Treaty, according to which Washington allegedly has the right to test and deploy space-based combat systems under the SDI program.

The ABM Treaty gives no such right either to the U.S. or the Soviet side. According to the London GUARDIAN, the U.S. visitors assured the British prime minister that the U.S. Administration had no intention of speeding up testing and deployment of Star Wars arms without consulting its NATO allies. However, U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger indicated almost at the same time that there was a possibility of such tests starting as early as next year. Who is to be believed? The U.S. Administration has evidently embarked on a course of undermining the ABM Treaty, but would also like its NATO allies to give their blessing and agreement to Washington's international arbitrariness toward such an important agreement. On one hand the United States signed the ABM Treaty, while on the other it waited for the moment to cast it aside as an empty piece of paper, by this time having created [sozdav] certain space strike weapon systems.

Naturally the question arises as to whether one can rely on accords with Washington if its administration negates documents of fundamental importance for peace for the sole fact that these accords hinder the militarization of space.

The Soviet Union, for its part, makes every effort to prevent arms being put into space. Were this to happen, thousands and tens of thousands of warheads, capable of crashing any moment to earth, would be flying in earth orbits above people's heads. THE WASHINGTON POST is correct when it says that if such missiles are deployed in space, the United States may destabilize the strategic equilibrium that now exists.

There are now up to 50,000 nuclear weapons stockpiled in the world. Their yield is the equivalent of a million bombs similar to the one that was dropped on Hiroshima. To add space weapons to such an arsenal as well is simply lunacy. Describing the position of the Reagan administration on the ABM question, Gerard Smith, former head of the U.S. delegation at the SALT I talks, says in THE BALTIMORE SUN that the administration's decision to unilaterally alter the ABM Treaty's interpretation jeopardizes not only one of the last foundations of Soviet-U.S. agreements in arms control, but may also preclude the possibility of Washington concluding any new accords with the USSR. The current Washington Administration is evidently trying to achieve precisely this.

CHERNYSHEV CRITICIZES KISSINGER NEWSWEEK ARTICLE

LD262046 Moscow TASS in English 2024 GMT 26 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 26 TASS -- By Tass military writer Vladimir Chernyshev:

At a reception in Moscow three weeks ago former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger promised to give me some time later an interview on Soviet-American relations and talks on disarmament. In the days that have passed since then he talked so much about his personal view of the aforementioned problems that, frankly speaking, I lost any wish to meet him and debate these problems with him. Yet I would like to make some remarks about his article that was just published in the NEWSWEEK magazine.

First of all, Mr. Kissinger turned out to be fundamentally against a nuclear-free world. The Soviet proposals submitted in Reykjavik, the proposals which kindled hopes everywhere in the world for a radical turn toward universal security and which, should they be accepted, would lead to a breakthrough on all the directions of the struggle for the limitation and elimination of nuclear weapons, are not to his liking. "It is too late to pursue the mirage of eliminating nuclear weapons", the former secretary of state writes. He believes this is simply impossible, either by agreement among statesmen or by technological expedients such as a leak-proof space shield, the space shield, which, as President Reagan asserts, is aimed at making nuclear weapons "obsolete and impotent". Hence, according to Kissinger, there is no way out of a nuclear trap and humanity is doomed to live constantly under the threat of nuclear destruction.

If Mr. Kissinger had his way, then, out of the "Reykjavik framework", only the 50-per cent reduction of strategic forces would stand. But even such a step, according to his classification, can be described only as "symbolic". As to the zero option on medium-range missiles, it should go, since the removal of U.S. missiles from Western Europe would eliminate the American ability to deal a nuclear strike (certainly, at the USSR) from Europe. Meanwhile, the former U.S. secretary of state considers SDI "a major contribution to Western strategy." He believes that any restrictions on SDI would make it seneless and a long moratorium on its deployment would be a trap.

In order to take the bearing in these "subtleties" one should address oneself to Dr. Kissinger's writings of the pre-Reykjavik period. In his memoirs Kissinger described strategic parity between the USSR and the USA as a strategic nightmare for the United States. Meanwhile he actually glorified the arms race, regarding it as extremely advantageous for the United States. He wrote that a war of attrition is a war which the Soviet Bloc cannot win.

To prevent the implementation of the plans of transformations in the USSR, to frustrate them by the arms race -- this is what prompts Mr. Kissinger's present deliberations about a "mirage" of a nuclear-free world. This is what is behind his assertions that the Reykjavik framework is "extremely disadvantageous," and that SDI supplementing the U.S. nuclear arsenal is a means of breaking away from a "nuclear nightmare" through space.

It could be reminded to Kissinger that Ronald Reagan himself in his "stellar speech" of March 1983 admitted that defensive systems combined with offensive ones could be viewed as a factor suiting an aggressive policy.

I think there was hardly a need for Mr. Kissinger coming to Moscow to see enthusiasm of the Soviet people which is building its state and which dreams of peace and exerts efforts to ensure it. He has not learned any useful lessons from his trip. And the former U.S. secretary of state could come out with the recommendations contained in the NEWSWEEK magazine without leaving home.

TV PANEL ON INTERNATIONAL PEACE, SECURITY ISSUES

LD231620 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1615 GMT 19 Feb 87

["Resonance: For Peace and Security in Asia" program, presented by political observer Farid Mustafyevich Seyful-Mulyukov with Vladimir Mikhaylovich Vinogradov, member of the collegium of the USSR Foreign Ministry and RSFSR foreign minister; Mikhail Stepanovich Kapitsa, director of the Academy of Sciences Institute of Oriental Studies; Admiral Nikolay Nikolayevich Amelko, representative of the Defense Ministry; and Vsevolod Vladimirovich Ovchinnikov, PRAVDA political observer]

[Excerpts] [Seyful-Mulyukov] Hello, esteemed viewers. [Seyful-Mulyukov shown standing before a map of Asia and the Pacific] We meet with you once again in the television studio where the live program "Resonance" is about to begin. The subject that we present for discussion today is the problems of peace and security in Asia -- that immense mass of land and people occuring one-third of the earth's land area and containing more than two-thirds of all humanity. Asia is a continent of great civilizations. Its peoples have enriched world progress with their unique experience of struggle for freedom and independence, and the renaissance of Asia is exerting a growing influence both on the world economy and on world politics. It is in that part of the world that, through the fault of the U.S. neoglobalists, the hotbeds of military tension remain unextinguished -- from the Korean Peninsula to Kampuchea, Afghanistan and the Near East. Dragged into the maelstrom of the ruinous arms race are countries that are suffering from bitter need and hunger.

Asia today is not protected by an impenetrable wall from the alarms and worries of the rest of the world. The threat of nuclear conflagration, which had reduced Hiroshima and Nagasaki to ashes, is knocking at the doors of Asian homes, too. The path of the atomic bomb, Jawaharlal Nehru said at the dawn of the nuclear age, does not lead to peace or freedom. Many years later, the leaders of two friendly states signed in the Indian capital the Delhi Declaration, which brings together our philosophical and political approaches toward building a nuclear-free and nonviolent world with the approaches of the great India and the billions of people represented by the Nonaligned Movement. As was shown by the international forum in Moscow, in which authoritative representatives of Asia took part, those ideas are becoming the sign of our times. For every person and for every nation this begins at the threshold of their homes.

More than one-third of Asia is in the territory of the Soviet Union. At the 27th party congress, and afterwards in the speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in Vladivostok and in his speeches in India, a comprehensive program of struggle to ensure peace, security, and cooperation in Asia and the Pacific basin was developed. The situation in those regions, as you will understand, represents a national, a state interest for our country.

Now I should like to introduce to you those taking part today in our television program "Resonance." [Seyful-Mulyukov walks across the studio to take his seat at the table where the panel is seated, and he introduces each in turn as the camera shown them in close-up.]

Vladimir Mikhaylovich Vinogradov, member of the collegium of the USSR Foreign Ministry and RSFSR foreign minister. Comrade Vinogradov has been our country's ambassador to Japan, Egypt, and Iran, and was a USSR deputy foreign minister.

Mikhail Stepanovich Kapitsa, director of the Academy of Sciences Institute of Oriental Studies. For many years Comrade Kapitsa was engaged in diplomatic work as the Soviet ambassador to Pakistan and as the USSR deputy foreign minister.

Admiral Nikolay Nikolayevich Amelko, representative of the Defense Ministry. Nikolay Nikolayevich has been commander of the Red Banner Pacific Fleet, deputy commander in chief of the USSR Navy, and deputy chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces.

Vsevolod Vladimirovich Ovchinnikov, PRAVDA political observer. For a number of years he was the newspaper's correspondent in Japan, China, and Britain.

Esteemed viewers, you can dial any of the telephone numbers shown here [screen shows list of numbers], and those taking part in our program "Resonance" will answer the questions that interest you. While our comrades are receiving their first few questions and sorting them out by subject, here is a brief video for you to watch to remind you what has happened in the past, and what is happening now in that region. [5-minute video overlaid with announcer-read commentary recalls the U.S. atomic bombing of Japanese cities and the resulting destruction; U.S. military action in Korea and Vietnam; U.S. military presence in the Pacific -- specifically Diego Garcia and the Philippines; the Iran-Iraq war which "is being fueled by U.S. military supplies to Iran"; and the French nuclear tests on Muroroa Atoll]

The video you have just been watching has, as it were, introduced us to the subject and enabled us to feel what the situation was like in the past and what the current situation is in the Asian-Pacific region.

The first questions have already come in from our viewers. To begin with, I have selected this question from engineer Viktor Zaytsev in Tambov: Asia is an ocean of the most varied states, a continent of conflicts. How can a common denominator for all these countries be found in questions of security and peace? How is the Soviet Union action to construct the foundatons of security in Asia?

Mikhail Stepanovich, that's not only a philosophical question, but a topical political one. Could you reply, please?

[Kapitsa] Mankind has accumulated a great deal of experience in solving complicated world problems. Eleven years ago there was the Helsinki conference at which a very important declaration was adopted: the Final Act of the all-European conference on security and cooperation in Europe. Whatever happens in Europe, Europe nonetheless lives in accordance with that Act. The European process is continuing: Conferences are held on the question od detente, humanitarian cooperation, economic cooperation, and cultural links. Couldn't that experience be transferred to Asia and the Pacific basin? After all, in Asia there have been more wars than anywhere else since the WW II. It can be transferred and the Soviet Union is of the opinion that real opportunities for this exist.

The 27th party congress, the speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in Vladivostok, and his speech to the Indian Parliament last November outlined a broad program of struggle for security and cooperation in the Asian-Pacific region.

Sometimes we are asked why the Soviet Union embarked on this, because the Soviet Union is both an Asian and a European country, and it would be better, they say, if the purely Asian countries involved themselves in this. Mikhail Sergeyevich gave a very good reply to this in Vladivostok: We are not pursuing any selfish aims; we are not thinking of our security alone. We are also an Asian country -- two-thirds of our territory is in Asia -- and we are convinced that if what we have managed to do so far in Europe is to triumph in Asia, and if the whole Eurasian continent was to become a zone of security and international cooperation, then this would have a decisive influence on the world situation as a whole.

Another thing they say is that in Europe it was easier to do that. In Asia there are considerably more questions: virtually every country has complex problems. It's true -- there are more problems in Asia. It took 11 years to prepare for the European conference. But let's say that in Asia it would take 15-20 years: Does that mean that nothing should be done? On the contrary, right now we need to embark on solving the problem before fresh conflicts break out in Asia and whole mountains of weapons are stockpiled.

What do we propose to do? We propose action in three directions, as it were: The first direction is imparting greater dynamism to bilateral and multilateral regional relations between states. What I have in mind is that in the course of these relations, disputed issues would be settled, and trust would grow. The second direction is settlement of situatons of conflict -- settlement in such a way as to guarantee the right of the peoples concerned to a choice, a choice of social system and a choice of friends. As soon as this principle is recognized by all, it will not be difficult to resolve all the situations of conflict that are occurring at the moment in Asia. The third direction is reduction of military confrontation, the elimination of military confrontation, the reduction of armies and fleets, implementation of confidence-building measures, guarantees for safety of communications, and a whole range of other measures.

By moving in these three directions, the states of Asia and the Pacific would at some point in history, say in 20 years' time, arrive at a situation where an atmosphere will have been created making it possible to convene an Asian-Pacific Helsinki conference and draft a code of behavior for the countries of Asia and the Pacific. The task is not an easy one, it will require a good deal of time, but the Soviet leadership is convinced that the peoples of Asia and the Pacific are up to this task.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Thank you. Comrade Solovyev, Vladimir Yakovlevich, a retired colonel from Feodosiya, has asked the following question: I have read that our proposals for creating a security system in Asia and the Pacific have met with a cool reception in Tokyo and some other capitals. What is behind this?

Vsevolod Vladimirovich, before you start answering this question, I would like to quote the words of Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone. Comparing the problems of security in Europe and in Asia, he said: In European printings, all the details are depicted, and very little is left to the imagination. In Japanese printings, the empty spaces are what determine the meaning, and so you need imagination, which acquires decisive significance. Vsevolod Vladimirovich, you are an expert on Japan, and for many readers and viewers your book "The Cherry Branch" [Vetka Sakury] has become a kind of encyclopedia of the Japanese character. Over to you.

[Ovchinnikov] Well, first of all, I would like to express complete agreement with what Mr Nakasone said, as far as the canons of Western and Oriental art are concerned. But to employ this metaphor, I think that the Soviet initiatives could, in fact, be compared to an oriental painting where the artist leaves everyone wide scope to think things through.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Leaves something to the imagination?

[Ovchinnikov] To the imagination. That is, the Soviet Union is not trying to impose on anyone its own formula for pan-Asian security. It does not have any ready recipe, nor any magic key. The essence of the Soviet initiatives is an invitation for a joint search; may the formula for pan-Asian security be the fruit of joint efforts and a reflection of everybody's interests. In fact, the direction for moving roward this aim, which was sketched out in Vladivostok, is just an outline, and, just as there is on the scroll of an Oriental artist, there is enough free space there. Thus we await counterinitiatives; we expect other proposals. I repeat: We expect joint work. If we can go from the canons of art to the prose of politics, then official Tokyo probably has quite definite grounds or motives for such a negative attitude.

The way they reason ther is this: Moscow, they say, is talking about an Asiatic Helsinki, but Helsinki is the collective reaffirmation of postwar borders, so what about Japanese territorial claims that the Soviet Union rejects? This can hardly be sufficient grounds to brush aside such a broad theme as pan-Asian security, which is vitally important for all.

I also would like to mention errors of another kind that stem from the fact that the term security is unilaterally interpreted, as if it concerned only military security is unilaterally interpreted, as if it concerned only military security, as if to say that the Soviet Union wanted to draw the countries of the region into some kind of Asian-Pacific pact, to make allies of them in its conflict with Washington. There also have been some people in countries such as India to whom the question has occurred whether this is in keeping with the principle of nonalignment, with a nonbloc policy. I think that following the high-level Soviet-Indian talks, such unclear matters have been eliminated. It was stressed that the point is not by any means about a mechanical translation of the Helsinki scheme to Asian soil, but about more vigorously implementing the principles that once were elaborated by the Asian peoples themselves, drawing on the experience of Europe. I would like to recall the words of Rajiv Gandhi: He said that the principles of Panca Sila, of Bandung, of nonalignment, which the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee referred to in Vladivostok provide a legal and political framework for analysis of the complex and particular problems of peace and security in the Asian-Pacific region. Thus, as has just been noted at the Moscow forum, in Vladivostok we invited the countries of Asia and Africa [as heard] to a joint search for security for each and all.

[Seyful-Mulykov] Incidentally, when issues of European security were being discussed at the Moscow forum, someone suggested establishing an institute to study the whole spectrum of security problems. To begin with, it would not be at all bad to create such an institute in Asia, where competent scientists, politicians, and military figures could consider in general the creation of a secure and peaceful house for the whole of the Asian Continent.

Let us go on to other questions. A viewer, Dr Dmitriy Avramovich Dorogan from Dnepropetrovsk, asks: The Soviet Union has proposed starting talks on reducing numbers of warships in the Pacific and Indian Oceans.

What situation has formed in the sea lanes? This is your field Nikolay Nikolayevich, please carry on.

[Amelko] Yes, it is evidently for me. In fact, yes, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev proposed in his Vladivostok speech, alongside a cardinal reduction of fleets in the Pacific Ocean zone, that we start with something small, with security of communications. First of all, one should point out that shipping lanes, freight by sea, is the cheapest means, and in this region they occupy quite a broad amount of space, and there is a great deal of transport traffic there. Suffice it to say that every day about 400 vessels cross the East China Sea. In the same time frame there are about 2,500 vessels crossing the Indian Ocean. There is no doubt that this is of great importance to all countries of the region, and I should point out that for the Soviet Union this is, in essence, the only year-round passage from the European part to the Far East.

Security of this shipping is indubitably of colossal importance. Are there any reasons for concern about this shipping? Yes, with doubt. The activities of fleets in the region, and of the U.S. Navy, in particular -- the U.S. 7th Fleet based in the Western Pacific -- hamper this shipping and represent a certain danger. Let me give an example: all exercises held there definitely force ships to avoid the area; the closing of an area and firing practice interrupt the normal activities of vessels carrying national economic cargoes and other necessary materials, especially oil, which Japan, in particular, uses. Indeed, the tankers are going mainly to Japan and this is the cheapest means of transport. Suffice it to say that a modern tanker can carry up to 20 trainloads, heavy trainloads of 5,000 metric tons, there is concern.

Take the annual exercises called Team Spirit that the U.S. Armed Forces carry out in South Korea, the Korean Strait, and the Sea of Japan, in which a large number of ships and aircraft take part. For example, the naval forces of the United States, Japan Australia, Canada, and Britain had up to 60 ships taking part in the Western Pacific in the last exercises in 1986. There were 2 aircraft carrier strike groups, 3 amphibious assault landing groups, and up to 250 aircraft. There were also the (Kayam) exercises, the Japanese naval forces together with the U.S. 7th Fleet based in the Philippines and Japan. Up to 100 vessels take part, including an aircraft carrier strike group from the 7th Fleet and an operational group of missile ships. These exercises are held in central Japan. The purpose of all these exercises is provocative, to create tension and to intimidate countries in the region that are in favor of a nuclear-free zone and the elimination of the bases, of establishing neighborliness and respecting the sovereignty of these countries. These exercises interfere with normal shipping.

In his speech to Indian MP's, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev also noted maritime terrorism, and not without grounds. May I cite several examples of this, as well. On 20 March 1984, our Soviet tanker "Lugansk" was blown up by a mine in Nicaragua. On 9 July 1984 the "MV Knud Jespersen" hit a mine in the Red Sea. On 2 September 1986, the "MV Petr Yemtsov" was fired on by an Iranian warship and a shell hit its bow. Finally, the most recent example: on 6 February 1987, in the South China Sea, a U.S. Orion aricraft made three passes over our vessel the Akademik Shikalskiy at an altitude of 40 meters -- that is, almost catching the mast. There are many such examples; in 2 years alone we have registered 179 passes by U.S. aircraft over Soviet merchant vessels and 39 dangerous maneuvres by warships in the vicinity of our vessels. This is terrorism. Thus, there is no doubt that the proposal forwarded by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to reduce military activities of fleets in the region has a direct bearing on the safety of merchant shipping and on the reduction of tension in the region. This would seem to be a brief answer to the question the comrade has asked.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Thank you very much. Now let us go on to another theme, the Near East. Comrade Zhukov, Anatoliy Valentinovich, a senior scientific worker from Khimki, asks the following: For many years the Near East crisis has been a regular topic for diplomats and the press. Is there any realistic way out of this crisis that undermines many countries' security? Is it not time that fresh approaches were sought to resolve the Near East's problems? Vladimir Mikhaylovich, you headed the Soviet delegation during the first international peace conference on the Near East in December 1973 at the end of another war in the region. Would you answer the question, please?

[Vinogradov] In general, it is a legitimate way of asking the question. The more complex the problem, evidently the greater the efforts that should be undertaken to find a way to resolve it, including a search for fresh approaches to solving problems of this kind. The Near East problem is indeed one of the most complex problems. Just a few days ago, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev put it very well, saying that this is a sensitive nerve center in the world, where the interests of many states, not just the Arab states and Israel, intersect. This is a crossroads of history, of religion, and of culture. The problem is complex and thus far has not yielded to solution. The question of fresh approaches faces us. In order to find fresh approaches, I think we must proceed from a position where these approaches would lead to a proper and just settlement.

In order to determine what correct and just settlement there might be, at least something must be said about what the essence of the Near East conflict is. In fact, the situation is this: In 1947, the British mandate over the territory of Palestine, by decision of the UN General Assembly, led to a division into three states formations -- the Jewish state, the Arab state, and Jerusalem as an independent state. Fifty-six percent of the territory was allocated to the Jewish state, with about 4-500,000 Jews and 725,000 Arabs living there, and there were many living in Jerusalem. That was the plan, the intention. What do we have now? At present we have a situation where all the territory of Palestine has been occupied by Israel, and with an overfulfilment of the plan, so to speak: Apart from Palestinian territory, Israel also has occupied a considerable portion of the territory belonging to Syria, the Golan Heights, south Lebanon, and the Gaza Strip, a small territory on the shore of the Mediterranean, and it does not want to leave these territories. Thus, as a result of Israel's occupation by force, an entire people has been driven from its home. The Arab Palestinians, or Palestinian Arabs, have been deprived of the right to create their own state. that is the essence of the problem.

There is another aspect: the military-political one. The fact is that Israel would not be able to conduct such a policy if it did not enjoy powerful financial support from the biggest financial circles in the world -- especially the United States -- and did not have direct U.S. military support. Israel has a population of about 4 million, while the Arab states amount, I think, to more 120 million. An alliance has been concluded between Israel and the United States for strategic cooperation; that is the military-political side of the matter. So how can this problem now be solved? A problem can only be solved when it does not lead to emergence of new problems. There must be a just solution and there only can be a just solution if there is satisfaction of the demands that the people of Palestine legitimately make, and which the people of Syria, Lebanon, and other Arab states legitimately make.

But Israel does not wish to agree to this. Every plan always stumbles on Israel's total rejection of even the very idea of leaving the occupied territories. There have been many attempts to resolve this problem, since it is constantly leading to wars. There have been efforts at mediation in the form of missions by Gunnar Jarring, a special representative of the UN general secretary; but they failed since Israel refused to cooperate with him, while the Arabs agreed.

Once, in 1973, things went as far as war. Strange as it may seem, a fairly favorable situation for a peace settlement then formed, because for the first time in history the Israeli Armed Forces felt that they were not so invincible after all -- they could suffer defeat; secondly, the Arab states gained confidence that they might after all enter into political talks, whereas they previously had rejected them. Finally, a unity of Arab states, which had not existed before, was formed, making it possible to exert strong pressure on the United States and Israel. Finally, there is even the paradoxical fact that although it was the Arabs who started the war, nobody in the world condemned them; everyone thought that the Arabs would win back their occupied lands. The first international peace conference on Palestine, or on the Near East, rather, was convened, and something strange happened. Once the conference had opened and the fine speeches about peace had been made, the United States, together with Israel and, unfortunately, Egypt, simply left the conference, breaking all pledges and accords. They just got up and left. Why? Because, evidently, it was clear that a just solution could only be along one path, that of just satisfaction of the demands made by the Arabs. The shameful road to the Camp David deal had been started -- the Camp David deal with Egypt and the attempts to foist in on others.

Now, as before, the Israelis, the Israeli Government, is opposed to convening an international peace conference, even though on this score there are decisions by the UN General Assembly that have been adopted by the overwhelming majority of states. I think only Israel and the United States voted against it. Why have we come up with a fresh approach to the problem, the calling of another international conference? Because no bilateral talks, given no clearly expressed willingness by Israel to settle the question fairly, are going to lead to anything but hard bargaining for concessions from one state after another. Meanwhile, the world community, including the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain, France, the great powers, and others, can help to settle these issues. But this conference is being blocked, as I have told you, by the United States and Israel, although within Israel itself, I must say, there are differences in approach to this matter.

It seems to me that opinion is becoming more and more mature among the Israelis that perhaps they should think of real ways to escape the crisis, for there cannot be eternal war with the Arabs. What is better, peace or war? Should they live in constant fear of war, or in peace? It is we who demonstrated a new approach; we came up with the initiative by proposing that a preparatory committee be formed for convening an international conference -- that is, to start practical work, perhaps to eliminate whatever fears some states may have that the Soviet Union might not play an appropriate role. Things are moving in this direction, but not at a fast enough rate. What are the prospects, to reply to the very easy question from the dear viewer? The prospects for settlement of the Near East conflict depend, of course, on many factors.

It seems to me that they depend first and foremost on whether the United States finally understands the need to display the new political thinking we are talking about now.

We are trying to pass on the idea to all politicians of the world that new political thinking must be based on realities, not on the fruits of fantasy nor on desires which may be unrealizable, or which could be realized today, but would later return as a threat to future generations of Israelis. Second, it seems to me that prospects depend on how much Israeli public opinion and the Israeli people com to understand that it is better to live in peace, to make peace with the Arabs before it is too late, and to strive for settlement of all claims in order to achieve peace and live within secure and recognized borders. We advocate peace between the Israelis and Arabs. Finally, I think the matter depends to a great extent on the extent to which a front presented by the various Arab states and the various detachments of the Arab national liberation movement is united. Excuse me for going on so long, but the question...

[Seyful-Mulyukov, interrupting] Thank you. The Near East problem has been under discussion at the UN for 40 years. Of course, we do not have that sort of time to discuss all the details of this problem. I would like to say two things. The abasence of Arab unity has a very negative influence on the stepping up of the process of a Near East settlement, as does the obstructionist policy conducted by the United States and Israel. At present, Israeli Prime Minister Shamir is in Washington holding talks with Reagan and members of his administration. Before his departure for Washington, he stated that his main task is to convince America not to agree to convening an international conference on the Near East, come what may.

Mikhail Stepanovich, it looks like you have already accumulated some questions. Please do join in the conversation.

[Kapitsa] I have several questions here. Vadim Yurgevich Leonov, from Lipetsk, asks what the relations are like between China and the Soviet Union. Viktor Alekseyevich Yakov from Chelyabinsk asks: Please tell us in detail about China's attitude to the Soviet Union's moratorium on nuclear explosions. Viktor Dmitriyevich Bogomolov asks: What border questions does China have with the Soviet Union? Could you go into this in some detail, please? I have another question here. [Kapitsa puts this question aside]

Relations between the Soviet Union and China have developed in a complicated, zigzag fashion. Following the victory of the Chinese revolution and the foundation of the Chinese People's Republic in 1949, for approximately 10 years relations developed under a cloudless sky and were filled with profound contentment. There was economic cooperation, reciprocal trade, and close links in the field of culture. The border was a border of friendship. The Soviet Union and China interacted with one another on the world scene in the struggle for peace and actively supported the national liberation movement in its struggle against imperialism and colonialism.

In the following decade, relations began to worsen and reached a particularly low point during the cultural revolution. The Chinese comrades themselves are now sharply criticizing the cultural revolution and believe it was a misfortune and an immense tragedy for China. It must be said bluntly that the cultural revolution did quite a great deal of damage to Soviet-Chinese relations.

After the cultural revolutions, relations developed again in a complicated fashion. China oriented itself primarily toward developing relations with Western countries, and its relations with the Soviet Union and the socialist countries were, to put mildly, unfriendly. After the 12th congress in 1982, the Chinese leadership made substantial modifications to its foreign policy.

These included certain modifications with regard to the Soviet Union. Two streams came together: The Soviet Union's long-standing striving to overcome difficulties and to normalize relations with China, and China's desire to start developing relations in certain areas.

In the past 4 years, a great deal already has been done. Relations are developing with particular success in practical areas. Take trade: In the last 4 years trade between the Soviet Union and China has increased 9-fold and last year amounted to R1,700 million. Both sides have the intention of increasing trade so as to reach R3,000 million, and perhaps more, in 1990. Border trade is expanding more and more: It is very advantageous both to the Soviet oblasts bordering on China and to the corresponding Chinese provinces.

Economic cooperation has revived. In the 1950's, as we all know, the Soviet Union built 156 major enterprises in China, and in China to this day they still highly appreciate the Soviet Union's assistance in building those enterprises, which have become the basis for Chinese industrialization. Now the sides have agreed to resume economic cooperation, and there is already an accord on participation by the Soviet Union in the reconstruction of 17 enterprises and the construction of 7 new enterprises, and the question of considerably increasing that number is under discussion. The Soviet Union has given its agreement to assist China in completing the railway across Xinhiang to the Soviet border, so that in a few years' time the Soviet Union and China will be linked by another main railway line.

Scientific and technological cooperation has resumed. Post-graduate and graduate student exchanges between the sides have started: 200 Chinese post-graduate students are studying in China. That is a small number when you consider that during the 1950's the Soviet Union helped train 10,000 people in higher education for China.

The situation on the border is calm overall. As far as the positions of the sides on international questions are concerned, there are individual issues and there are problems of relations with certain countries on which our positions do diverge. For example, the Afghan problem, the Cambodian problem, the problem of who bears the responsibility for the arms race -- the Chinese concept is that both superpowers bear almost the same degree of responsibility for the arms race. At the same time, one can trace a growing proximity in the positions of the Soviet Union and China toward the struggle for peace and international security. For example, China has stated that it will make no first use of nuclear weapons and that in no way, under no circumstances, will it use nuclear weapons against a state that does not possess them. As everybody knows, our position is the same. China is in favor of disarmament and, as a first step, a 50 percent reduction in the arms of the Soviet Union and the United States. That in fact coincides with our position. China is in favor of a reduction in tension in the Pacific, and so are we. China is in favor of a nuclear-free zone in Korea, and our position is the same. China is expressing concern at the accelerated militarization of Japan; we also are concerned that Japan is increasing its expenditure on military requirements and is stepping up its arms buildup.

In this regard, replying to one of the questions, I would like to mention that the Chinese side welcomed the Soviet moratorium, the unilateral ceasing of atomic tests by the Soviet Union. It regrets that there has been no response to that moratorium and that tests will be resumed. As far as China is concerned, it has not carried out any nuclear tests for some time.

Now, one more question about the territorial problem: talks were held between the Soviet Union and China on the border question from 1969 through 1978. Those talks did not result in anything, because the sides argued about whether or not there were any disputes about the Soviet-Chinese border. The Chinese side states that there are disputes -- the territories which they say the Soviet Union is retaining outside treaty limits. The Soviet Union states that there are no disputes. It is a fact that the border treaties were signed over 100 years ago. In a number of areas no border demarcation was drawn. Some natural events took place, and apparently in some individual places there are deviations from the treaty border, the historical border. The natural thing to do -- and this is our position -- would be for both sides to check the border. Wherever it seems that we have crossed the borderline, then by all means we are ready to go back to the treaty border; and wherever the Chinese side has deviated from the border, well then, it will have to go back to the treaty border. We are of the opinion that given good will, agreement can be reached on this, particularly as both China and the Soviet Union are socialist states. Surely we are not going to argue about this?

Finally, I would like to add that a few days ago talks began in Moscow: the first round of fresh talks on border questions started. Now that round is coming to an end. The talks are of a closed nature, Thus, I am not going to comment on them now, but the position of the Soviet Union is that it would be very useful if we managed to remove the so-called territorial dispute from the relations between the Soviet Union and China.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Excuse me, but we are very short on time; we are getting a vast quantity of questions on various aspects of Asiatic-Pacific security, So I ask you to make your replies to the questions very brief.

[Kapitsa] All right. A question from Aleksandr Fedorovich Mukhin: There are periodical armed clashes on the PRC-SRV border, instigated by China. What claims does Vietnam make against China, and what is China trying to achieve by making armed attacks on Vietnam?

In 1979, there were very serious armed confrontations on the border between China, when Chinese troops crossed the borders and waged military operations in a number of northern provinces of Vietnam. Since then there have been clashes on the border from time to time. The Chinese side says that the Vietnamese border troops cross the border in various places and are the instigators of the clashes. The Vietnamese comrades say that there are no violations of the border by them and that, on the contrary, Chinese units have occupied various segments of Vietnam's territory and that China embarks on military and political pressure on Vietnam, especially when combat operations are being stepped up against the Pol Pot men on Cambodian territory. Our position is that the sides -- all the more so since they are socialist states -- China and Vietnam should settle their disputes by peaceful means. Vietnam has repeatedly expressed readiness to enter into talks, and we have more than once called upon both sides to sit down at the negotiating table and settle the problems they have.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Thank you. Comrades, I recall that there are several questions on Japan.

[Ovchinnikov] Yes, I have several questions, all from Muscovites. German Mikhaylovich Borisov asks what is hindering the conclusion of a peace treaty with Japan; Aleksandr Nikolayevich Sencho asks: A Northern Territories Day has been held in Japan -- what is the aim of staging it; what are its organizers trying to achieve? Comrade Zharkov asks: What is our government doing in response to the campaign to revise Soviet frontiers on Tokyo's part?

What hinders conclusion of a peace treaty with Tokyo? It is the unfounded territorial claims of the Japanese side. What are the organizers of the so-called Northern Territories Day trying to achieve? To put it very briefly, they are first and foremost trying ot achieve consolidation, I think, of public opinion on a nationalistic, chauvinistic basis, as if to say, let us forget social and class contradictions -- this is what should unite us. The whole Northern Territories Day campaign is nothing new, but what draws our attention at the moment is the background against which this year the Northern Territories Day was held on 7 February. What is the political context? All this is taking place at the very time that Japan has overstepped an important psychological barrier in building up its military potential. It has gone beyond the traditional limit of 1 percent of the gross national product which used to restrain growth of its military budget. It must be said that 1 percent is no small matter, either, because Japan's gross national product is very large, and 1 percent amounts to $22,000 million. If I am not mistaken, that is comparable to the size of the military budgets of Britain, France and the FRG, for example.

In addition, since the Japanese gross national product is growing quickly, Japan has been stepping up its military budget in recent years at a rate of 6 or 7 percent a year, while the United States has not been able to get a 3 percent growth from its NATO allies. But now these restrictions have been cast aside. Therefore, the military budget will be able to grow at an even faster rate. At the same time, last autumn Japan joined in with the U.S. Star Wars porgram, joined in with SDI, despite the three nonnuclear principles, despite parliamentary resolutions on the use of space for peaceful purposes only.

Finally, this year there have been major joint maneuvers with all three arms of the armed forces taking part, U.S.-Japanese maneuvers, that is, the integration of the armed forces of the two countries is being speeded up, as is standardization of combat technology, of administration, and so on. That is, we can see that the territorial claims, which are in essence of a revanchist nature, the demands for a revision of the postwar borders, are made against the background of a buildup of military potential, and, as you can understand, politically this is a very serious matter.

Well, what is our government undertaking? First of all, we consider this policy unrealistic, this placing of unfounded territorial claims to our country. We feel that it is not sensible to make the development of political, trade, economic and all other ties dependent upon this artificial issue. We say that if the Japanese side is not presently prepared to sign a peace treaty with the Soviet Union, let us for now put those aspects of our relations that have matured on a treaty basis, a legal basis. We propose concluding a treaty on neighborliness and cooperation, without touching on disputed issues for now, so to speak. The Japanese side is not agreeable to this.

Comrade Gennadiy Riskin asks us to speak in greater detail about plans for the militarization of space as it concerns Asia. Well, first of all, one must speak here, of course, about Japan's participation in the U.S. Star Wars program. As I have already said, this contradicts the Japanese Constitution and the three nonnuclear principles, and, at the moment, the Japanese ruling circles are having a very difficult time wriggling out of this. For example: They say, well, the three nonnuclear principles -- not producing, acquiring or importing nuclear weapons -- concern Japan and its national territory, but that the Star Wars program is in space, beyond the borders of Japan, and thus the three nonnuclear principles do not apply in this matter. Then they cite some ridiculous arguments to the effect that the Star Wars program is not a nuclear program. But when people say, what about the nuclear-pumped laser?

They reply that nuclear weapons are weapons that destroy and kill by the direct force of a nuclear explosion, but in the case of SDI, the energy of the nuclear explosion will be transformed into laser beams, and it is these that will strike the target. It turns out that the rifle has nothing to do with the bullets that do the killing. So there are many points of confrontation in this area between the peace-loving public of Japan and the position of the official circles.

Finally, there are other, economic, disputed aspects, because of course the United States wants to involve the scientific-technological and industrial potential of Japan in implementing the Star Wars program but does not want Japan to have use of the scientific-technological achievements that will crystallize from this program for its own civilian needs. Of course, this does not suit the Japanese, so the talks on the specific conditions for the participation of Japan in SDI are undergoing a very difficult time.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Thank you. Nikolay Nikolayevich, I have passed you a number of questions concerning purely military affairs. Please answer them briefly.

[Amelko] Certainly. Comrade Ovechin, Vladimir Vasiliyevich, a foreman from Krasnyy (?Kut), Kharkov Oblast, asks: Do any Asian countries possess submarines with nuclear warheads?

Well, as you know, the U.S. 7th Fleet is based in Asia, the western part of the Pacific and include atomic submarines of the Los Angeles type, which carry Tomahawk cruise missiles with a strike range of 2,600 km; and these missiles can be used with nuclear warheads. You have asked me to brief, and so...

[Seyful-Mulyukov, interrupting] I did not ask, Nikolay Nikolayevich; they ask us to be brief on television.

[Amelko] The United States has aircraft carriers in commission; but our country is putting large antisubmarine ships into service. What is the difference? How do they differ? This is asked by Comrade Aleksandr Vasilyevich Dolgikh from Kharkov, a driver.

Yes, the U.S. Navy today has 20 strike aircraft carriers. What is a strike aircraft carrier, in general? It is a floating airfield, with a displacement of 96,000 tonnes and carrying up to 100, or rather, 90 aircraft, of which 40 can carry nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union has no aircraft carriers, but there are ships carrying aircraft. The latest books and brochures from Voyenizdat [military publishing house] and APN publishers cite specific figures -- that the Soviet Union has six aircraft-carrying ships, as we call them. What is the difference between them? In the first place, these are smaller ships, and with a completely different purpose from strike aircraft carriers. They are intended for destroying ships near the shore, especially when assault troops are being sent out, for protecting our sea lanes, and for antisubmarine action. Incidentally, the United States has 12 such aircraft-carrying ships. The British also have such aircraft-carrying ships, of the Invincible type, 20,000 tonners, which also carry helicopters and vertical takeoff aircraft.

The next question: I have read in the papers that the Americans, the United States, are forcing Japan to expand its Navy, that they will patrol and defend zones thousands of miles from Japan. I would like to know how our country regards this matter. This question is from someone who is almost my namesake, Yevgeniy Ivanovich Amelkin.

Our attitude to this is a negative one. It is well-known that Japan's naval forces are being reborn, and reborn on a new technical basis. They already include about 15 submarines, more than 30 destroyers and frigates, including some with guided missiles, and they, as I have already said, hold joint exercises to practice strikes against the territory of the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist camp, among other things, from the sea.

There follows a question: What are we using to counter the U.S. armada at sea? Does our fleet have bases outside Soviet territories? The question come from (?Loginsk), from Vladimir Gavrilovich Baykuber.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] We have a similar question from Aleksey Ivanovich Postnikov from Moscow.

[Amelko] The fact of the matter, dear comrade viewers, is that every country builds its navy in accordance with its doctrine and its policy. As is known, the Soviet Union's doctrine is a defensive one; hence, the Navy has a role of defending our territory and that of the countries in the socialist camp from the direction of the sea. For that reason, the composition of our fleet is intended primarily to destroy the threat that exists from the sea. If the United States constantly keeps two, and sometimes more, aircraft carrier strike forces off the shores of Japan, and keeps naval bases in Japan and the Philippines, we must correspondingly take appropriate steps to neutralize this threat.

The difference in the structure and the structural orientation of the fleet is that for our country we have a purely defensive one for destroying the sea threat, while for the Americans the opposite is the case. Their fleet is characterized by the fact that all aircraft carrier strike forces and the submarines with cruise missiles are intended primarily to inflict blows on land, on shore installations. It should also be mentioned that the so-called amphibious forces are very developed in the U.S. fleet. They are included for direct disembarkation onto the shore and for seizing territory. The Americans have 200,000 Marines, and the amphibious forces can move and simultaneously land up to one division of Marines onto a beach -- that is more than 40,000 men. It is quite natural that the Soviet Union must be at sea at the place from where the threat of these strike forces -- which are intended and are capable of striking against our territory and our shore installations -- comes.

Of late there has been a great deal of talk in the Western press, both in the United States and in Japan, about an increase in our Pacific naval fleet, about how it can go to sea and about its aggressiveness. Of course, these insinuations are not backed up by fact. Beyond dispute, it has increased incredibly in the last 20 years; it would, of course, be naive to keep for 20 years the ships we had then. Naturally, the Armed Forces, and the Navy in particular, are given quite definite tasks in defending our state, and the fleet develops in accordance with the development both of our economy and our capabilities. The Pacific Fleet is given new ships capable of neutralizing the threat from the sea. There is the reply, in brief.

The last question I have is an unusual one. Excuse me, Comrade Baykuber asked another question that I have not answered: whether there are bases outside the limits of Soviet territory. The question also has been made moot in the Western press of late, especially the Japanese press, due to reports on a super powerful naval base in Vietnam, at Cam Ranh Bay, which is supposed to be able to cut off all sea lanes and close all straits. Well, in the first place, there is no naval base capable either of cutting off sea lanes or closing straits. This is done by the forces at the base.

At Cam Ranh we have no naval base in the accepted sense of one with a full infrastructure. We have a material-technical supply point there, where our ships can and do call to take on water and food, buy vegetables and other produce from the Vietnamese, and to continue on their way, or perhaps to make minor repairs using their own facilities. This is no Subic Bay -- in the Philippines there is a U.S. naval base with both weapons stores and big repair enterprises and docks, and they have rented territory which Filipinos are not allowed to enter. At Cam Ranh, our ships lie alongside Vietnamese ships when they call, and it is used jointly. We quite legitimately call it a material-technical supply point. I should add that when the Americans were settling the issue of building a naval base in the Indian Ocean, one senator stated that it is no good if the U.S. aircraft carrier Constellation makes almost a round-the-world voyage in order to get to the Indian Ocean. However, it is about 7,500 km from Vladivostok to the Indian Ocean, but only 5,000 km from Subic Bay to the Indian Ocean. Apart from this, the U.S. ships fuel up in Singapore and Colombo, leaving them, in essence, something like 1,500 to 2,000 km. That is, they consider that this is necessary and indispensable for them, but the Soviet Navy has no need for it, and this is a violation that supposedly destabilizes the situation there. These are insinuations, pure and simple, and do not correspond to reality.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Thank you. May I remind everyone about the time limit once again; we have literally 12-15 minutes to the end of the program. We have had a series of questions concerning the reasons for the war between Iran and Iraq, and the possibilities for ending it. Vladimir Mikhaylovich, you were our country's ambassador in Tehran during a watershed period in the contemporary history of the country -- during the overthrow of the shah and the formation of the Islamic republic. You know the situation in the Persian Gulf very well. Would you answer, briefly, please?

[Vinogradov] These questions are asked by Dmitriy Dmitriyevich Arsedovich, from Brest Oblast, who wonders why the UN cannot solve the question of peaceful relations between Iran and Iraq; and by my namesake, Mikhail Isaakovich Vinogradov from Pyatigorsk, who would like to know in detail the reasons for the conflict and a forecast of what will happen.

Well, the reasons why the Iran-Iraq conflict broke out are very complex. There are many factors, and it's difficult to go into them all in a short perod of time. There are reasons of a historical nature, the age-old enmity between Iran and Iraq brought about by many reasons, including the Kurdish movement that flares up from time to time, both in Iran and Iraq; there were border questions; and there was the old question of pride as to who was the chief power in the Persian Gulf. In 1979 there was the popular, anti-imperialist, national-liberation, antimonarchical revolution in Iran, which led to Islamic rule in Iran.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Ultimately led to it.

[Vinogradov] Yes, ultimately led to it. It started out in a different way. Islamic rule in Iran proclaimed the slogan of world Islamic revolution, at least in those countries professing the Islamic faith. The thing is that in Iraq the predominant religion is Islamic, of the Shiite persuasion, in other words, the same kind as in Iran. Naturally, the spreading of propaganda of the Shiite Islamic revolution in Iraq could not, of course, but be of concern to the Iraqi Government. As a result of a number of complex factors, Iraqi forces decided to enter Iranian territory, and this in fact they did. War broke out, and this led first to the Iranians suffering defeat and retreating. Then, they managed to drive the Iraqi forces across the border and advance, albeit with great difficulty, into Iraqi territory.

The war became terribly embittered, very bloody and cruel, and it has been going on a long time, longer now than WW II.

But to say briefly what the reasons for the Iran-Iraq conflict are, my view would be that it is a clash of ideologies: the ideologies professed by the Iraqi Government, and those professed in Iran. Our view is that whatever ideology is professed is the business of each country, but in no event can such questions be resolved by force. Our attitude, therefore, is that this conflict should end as soon as possible, because it is fratricidal. No one needs it. It can be resolved by peaceful means, but the obstacle now is Iran's demand that the Iraqi Government be replaced. That is a purely internal matter for Iraq, and not subject to change from outside.

What are the prospects? The prospects may be very lamentable if the war continues. The chief danger is first that hundreds of thousands of people in both countries, particularly young people -- the best part of the population -- will be killed absolutely in vain, for incomprehensible reasons. The second political reason is that it is a convenient pretext for imperialist forces to worm there way into the region. I recall that as recently as the time of President Carter the Persian Gulf was proclaimed the frontline of defense of U.S. interests. Irangate is the best proof of this. The sooner this conflict ends, the better, and we are calling on both sides -- both Iraq and Iran, with both of whom we have good relations -- to do this.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Thank you. Mikhail Stepanovich, you have a question there about our country's intention to withdraw some of our forces from Mongolia. Could you answer that question, please?

[Kapitsa] Comrade Viktor Ivanovich Tomachev asks: The Soviet Union and Mongolia have agreed on the withdrawal of a considerable part of the Soviet contingent from Mongolia. What is the reason for this? Here is another question asking which of the Western powers asked the Soviet Union to do this.

None of the Western powers asked us to do this. The Soviet Union and Mongolia are of the opinion that at the present time they can withdraw part of the Soviet forces from Mongolia and that this will not diminish their security. That decision dovetails with the course of the Soviet Union, stated by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in Vladivostok, aimed at reducing the armies in the Far East and Asia.

[Amelko] And the Navy.

[Kapitsa] And the Navy, of course. The second question I have here is about the relations between North and South Korea and the prospects for those relations. The question has been asked by Comrade (Bakhaterad Omarufu). The relations at the moment are bad, and because of this the Korean peninsula is one of the most acute points -- I would say the most acute, because if a conflict breaks out there tomorrow, it may turn out to be a nuclear one from the very start. In South Korea there are 40,000 U.S. soldiers, and 1,000 nuclear weapons are stationed there -- both nuclear-capable aircraft and the recently stationed Lance missiles, which are capable of carrying nuclear warheads over a distance of 250 km.

North Korea is ready to hold talks with the United States and South Korea. North Korea has proposed a number of options for troop reductions, the setting up of a confederation, but it all depends now on the Americans.

First the Americans should start withdrawing their troops from South Korea; second, the Americans should enter talks with the PDRK -- and South Korea can take part in those talks -- on the signing of a peace treaty on Korea. Finally, the atmosphere would be created for bilateral talks between North and South Korea on the possible creation in the future of the Democratic Republic of Korea.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Thank you. Vesvolod Vladimirovich, an interesting question has come in from Vladimir Kuzmich Golovko in Moscow. What is the world reaction to the Rarotonga Treaty? That exotic island in the group of Cook Islands in the southern Pacific, known possibly only to geography lovers, now has become known to all. Why is that? Only briefly, you've got 2 minutes.

[Ovchinnikov] The treaty is a very interesting example of a promising trend of the practical implementation of the idea of setting up nuclear-free zones. A group of states in the southern Pacific signed the treaty proclaiming the region a nuclear-free zone, and they asked the nuclear powers to sign the protocols to the treaty. The first protocol concerned those powers that possess or which have some involvement in the running of certain territories in the southern Pacific. The second protocol concerned the pledge by which every nuclear power would respect the status of the nuclear-free zone, in other words not use nuclear weapons against the states in that zone. Finally, the third protocol related to not conducting nuclear tests and the pledge not to bury radioactive waste.

The Soviet Union was the first state to sign the second and third protocols to the Rarotonga treaty, and afterward these protocols were signed by China, but quite recently the United States stated that it would not sign the protocols. This might seem strange, because the United States does not carry out nuclear tests there at the moment: as everyone knows, it carries out its underground nuclear tests at a test site in Nevada. But the U.S. Government said that signing those protocols, in other words affirming by those protocols the status of the nuclear-free zone in the southern Pacific, would be contrary to U.S. national security interests. To put it simply, Washington is afraid that the nuclear allergy, in other words the growth of antinuclear sentiments, the distaste for nuclear weapons, the spreading of the example set by New Zealand, which has refused to allow ships carrying nuclear weapons or ships with nuclear-powered engines into its ports, and the growing antinuclear mood in the Philippines -- that all this will gain in momentum and will encroach on the interests of the Pentagon.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Thank you. Vladimir Mikhaylovich, I think you've got a question there?

[Vinogradov] Yes, Comrade Anatoliy Andreyevich Agapov from Moscow says: it was said in the press that some Arab countries support Iran. Could you comment on this fact, please?

Yes, it's true: Iran is supported by Syria, for example, prompted by its own internal political considerations and relations with other arab countries.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Thank you. We don't have a lot of time left, and we are getting a great many questions about Afghanistan. Afghanistan is not only our southern neighbor with whom we have a common border of 2,500 km. Linked with Afghanistan is the destiny of many of our people, and these questions are natural. In particular, Anastasiya Mikhaylovna Ganshina, a designer from Moscow, asks: What do you think: When could the troops be withdrawn from Afghanistan?

The Soviet leadership recently has stated firmly on more than one occasion its intention to withdraw Soviet troops from Afghanistan as soon as possible. In his speech at the Moscow forum, in particular, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said yet again that we will recall the whole of our military contingent from Afghanistan as soon as possible, but what is needed for this problem to be resolved is reciprocity on the part of the United States and Afghanistan's neighbors, as well as international efforts.

The Soviet Union is very active first and foremost on the talks front. You know that in recent weeks the Soviet leadership has had meetings in Moscow with Pakistani Foreign Minister Yaqub Khan and Iranian Foreign Minister Velayati. A constant contact is being maintained between Moscow and Kabul, and the most important thing is that we fully and completely support the course of the DRA toward national reconciliation and settlement of the Afghan problem by political means.

In the next few days, literally on February 25, there will be the start of a new round in the Afghan-Pakistani talks in Geneva conducted through the mediation of Cordovez, the personal representative of the UN secretary general. There are reassuring signs that these talks will progress at least very dynamically and constructively. The Pakistani side, at least in its official statements, and Yaqub said this on his return to Islamabad, as did Ziaul Haw during the recent meeting of Islamic leaders in Kuwait, that Pakistan views with interest the constructive initiatives by the Soviet Union concerning a political settlement around Afghanistan.

However, the settlement of the Afghan problem does not only depend on Pakistan -- It depends on Afghanistan first and foremost, as well as on other countries. Also directly involved in this is the United States, which is in all sorts of ways -- both militarily and financially -- supporting the counterrevolutionary groups and bands of dushman that carry out constant raids on Afghan territory. Despite the cease-fire declared on January 15, and observed by the Afghan Armed Forces, the dushman groups are waging a fight against both the Army and the civilian population. Moreover, they are now using Stingers and bringing down Afghan airline aircraft. All these facts indicate that there are forces that have no interest either in national reconciliation within Afghanistan or in a political settlement around Afghanistan.

A great many questions have come in related to the most varied aspects of security and peace in Asia and the Pacific. Quite a number of questions have also come in about the internal problems of the countries in this gigantic region. Unfortunately, we have not been able to reply to many of the questions that have come in to our "Resonance" program in the studio, but we will try to make up for this in our coming "Resonance" programs, "The World Today" programs, and other television broadcasts. It remains for me now to thank our viewers for their active participation in our program, and to thank those taking part in the program for the work that they have done with me to answer our viewers' questions. Thank you very much for watching, and goodbye!

GROMYKO MEETS UN SCIENTISTS, ANSWERS QUESTIONS

PM251634 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Meeting With UN Scientific Experts"]

[Text] On 17 February in the Kremlin, A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, received a group of prominent scientists, diplomats, and politicians who are taking part in the international meeting of UN experts in Moscow on the subject of "Problems of Mankind's Survival and Development on the Threshold of the 21st Century."

"This meeting," Academician P.N. Fedoseyev, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences and who represents the participants, said, "is organized by the UN Secretariat for the International Peace Year and the USSR Academy of Sciences Scientific Council for the Study of Problems of Peace and Disarmament. It will last from 17-19 February and will and end with the drawing up recommendations from the experts to the UN secretary general."

Taking part in the conversation were Miljan Komatina (SFRY), representative of the UN secretary general at the experts' meeting; Abdelkader Abbadi (Morocco), Khail Khamdani (Pakistan), and Robin Ludwig (United States), staffers of the UN secretariat; Kinkhide Musakodzi (Japan), prorector of the UN University; Marek Khagmayyer (Poland), general secretary of the World Federation of United Nations Associations; John Trent (Canada), general secretary of the International Association of Political Sciences; Candido Mendez (Brazil), chairman of the UNESCO International Council for Social Sciences; Roberto Aliboni, director of the Institute of International Relations; Jerome Wiesner (United States), president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Michel Lesage (Belgium), general secretary of the International Institute of Administrative Sciences; Maciej Nalecz (Poland), chairman of the International Pugwash Council; and Rolf Bjornerstedt (Sweden), representative of the Alva and Gunnar Myrdal Foundation. Here too were the Soviet scientists Academicians G.A. Arbatov and Ye.M Primakov and Doctors of Sciences O.N. Bykov, A.K. Kislov, and G.I. Morozov.

An exchange of opinions on a wide range of problems relating to the UN role in ensuring mankind's survival and development took place in a frank and friendly atmosphere.

A.A. Gromyko answered the scientists' questions about the problems under discussion. He stressed that the UN Charter enshrines everything necessary to ensure that the organization acts as an effective instrument for maintaining international peace and security.

We are convinced, he noted, that mankind cannot be doomed to eternal confrontation, that common sense and an elementary sense of self-preservation will prompt states to seek ways of overcoming the existing contradictions. The peoples are well aware of the disastrous consequences of nuclear war and will force those who are still trying to engage in brinkmanship and pursuing a policy of the arms race to reach agreements.

The resolution of mankind's global problems cannot be postponed any longer. The arms race, the ecological, energy, and resource problems, the economic backwardness of the developing countries -- all this creates a threat to mankind's existence and survival. No one state or group of states can resolve global problems. Constructive, creative collaboration among states and peoples on a global scale is needed here, a new way of thinking is needed. M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, spoke of this in detail on 16 February at the meeting with participants in the international forum "For a Nuclear-free World, for the Survival of Humanity."

Naturally, the United Nations can and must be a center for joint actions and cooperation among states in tackling problems of worldwide significance while complying strictly with the organization's charter.

For this to become possible, it is necessary to promote the ending of the arms race, the improvement of the international political climate, and the reorientation of the international community's efforts toward the tackling of the problems of all mankind.

The Soviet Union proceeds on the basis that the role of the machineries for international cooperation, and above all that of such a unique organization as the United Nations, in resolving the most important problems of development will increase all the time. That is why our country supports this international organization and struggles to increase its effectiveness and to establish within its walls a new approach to the resolution of international problems. M.S. Gorbachev's letter to the UN secretary general spoke of what specifically the Soviet Union did to ensure that International Peace Year justified the hopes pinned on it. Our country intends to continue to promote the effective utilization of the UN's potential under the humane slogan of International Peace Year, "Preserve peace and mankind's future."

A.A. Gromyko went on to answer other questions from the scientists.

M. Khagmayyer: Where does the Soviet Union see possibilities for improving the work of the IAEA?

A.A. Gromyko: We believe that the IAEA is a very important international organization. Recent events have shown that this organization must be strengthened. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium recently ratified two conventions drawn up within the framework of that organization. We call on all countries that have not yet ratified them to do so.

As for the IAEA's future prospects, the Soviet Union proposes the elaboration, under its auspices, of designs for a new generation of reactor systems, taking into account the latest achievements in the area of ensuring safety; a reliable system of measures to prevent attacks on nuclear targets; steps to prevent nuclear terrorism; and international legal regulation of responsibility for nuclear damage. These are the areas where accords must be reached. If they are reached, mankind will be much better off.

But the main aim that must be sought is nuclear disarmament, and the IAEA machinery can help here too.

M. Komatina: I am very impressed by your definition of the restructuring as a "revolution." I would like to know why you call it that. And a second question: If we were signing the UN Charter today, would it be possible to reach agreement on it?

A.A. Gromyko: First, as regards the restructuring, we sometimes use the expression "revolution." It is not a question of a social revolution. We mean a revolution in the management of state, economic, and social affairs, a revolution in people's thinking. What we are doing consists of profound processes covering all aspects of life. So we have reason to use such a word, to emphasize the radical nature of our measures.

Second, on the question about the UN Charter, I think today it would be more difficult to reach agreement on the relevant questions than it was when it was drafted and signed.

J. Trent: First, Mr Gromyko, I would like to thank you sincerely for receiving us today. Are there spheres in the United Nations in which changes could take place in its activity?

A.A. Gromyko: In the United Nations, one of the main organs is the Security Council. Under the organization's charter, it is supposed to ensure peace. The principle of unanimity of the permanent members of the Security Council operates there, and so it should. Without it the UN could not function at all. So the task is to continue to uphold this principle and struggle within the UN framework for the resolution of the most important problems of today, above all disarmament problems.

A. Abbadi: The Soviet Union recently submitted to the United Nations a proposal on creating a system of international security. In the light of this problem, how do you see the role of the Security Council in the nineties?

A.A. Gromyko: I do not think it is possible at present to achieve the necessary consensus on this question in the Security Council, unless certain powers, which are permanent members of the Security Council, change their negative stance. But there was a time when the three great powers were able to elaborate important accords, in Yalta, for instance. It would be good if they could act together today, too, in the interests of peaceful development.

In conclusion, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium wished the UN experts fruitful and successful work.

Also present at the talk were T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium leading workers M.Ye. Mogilevets, D.N. Nikitin, P.I. Sabayev, L.N. Chernikov, R.B. Eldarova, and E.L. Kuzmin.

REAGAN RECEIVES TOWER COMMISSION 'IRANGATE' REPORT

LD261735 Moscow TASS in English 1711 GMT 26 Feb 87

[Text] Washington February 26 TASS -- President Reagan was today submitted a report of the Tower Commission, set up to investigate the Irangate scandal. It is so far the most comprehensive official document disclosing numerous details of the Iran-contras operation, carried out in secrecy even from U.S. Congress, and the role of the President and many other senior officials in it.

The report criticizes the actions of individual White House officials, including White House Chief of Staff Donald Regan, which caused a serious foreign policy crisis for the United States. The commission, however, is not critical of the "strategic goals" of the administration in that operation.

The document also claims that the President was not aware of all the details of the operation and, what is most important, did not know about the unlawful transfers of millions of dollars to the contra gangs. It was to dispel such suspicious that was one of the main tasks of the Tower Commission, and the investigators went out of their way to absolve the administration of the charges that it had deliberately tried to cover the tracks and conceal the truth about the "Irangate." But according to a recent public opinion poll, the findings of which were released by the LOS ANGELES TIMES yesterday, 75 per cent of the Americans believe that the White House tried to conceal details of its secret operation.

SENATE COMMITTEE VOTES TO BAN CONTRAS AID 19 FEB

PM201455 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Feb 87 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Gan dispatch: "Against All Aid for the 'Contras.' Palpable Blow Against U.S. Administration Policy"]

[Text] Washington, 19 Feb -- The President's residence was today notified of a new, "very annoying" challenge to administration policy thrown down by the legislators. By a majority of votes the Senate Foreign Relations Committee adopted a proposal to ban all aid for the Somozist "contra" gangs.

Last year, under very strong pressure from administration lobbyists, Congress approved the appropriation of $100 million for the military needs of anti-Nicaraguan terrrorists. Of that sum, $60 million was allocated immediately, while the rest was subject to repeat approval by the legislators. With the passing of control over Congress into the hands of the opposition Democratic Party, the unpopular "dirty war" of the White House against the Sandinsta government in Managua became one of the chief targets for criticism on Capitol Hill. While in no way sympathizing with the Nicaraguan revolution, senators and congressmen nonetheless understand that the openly declared intention to overthrow the legitimate representative of that country's people with the help of bandits under CIA guardianship does not fit into any elementary moral framework, not to mention international law.

Reflecting this obvious truth, the decision of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reflects not only a refusal to make available the $40 million remaining from the administration request but also a refusal to allocate the $105 million that the administration would like to obtain for the next fiscal year of 1988. "The 'contras'' actions have failed from the military, diplomatic, and moral viewpoints," Senator A. Cranston stated.

The committee's stand does not mean that opponents of interference in Nicaraguan affairs will succeed in closing Washington aid channels to the "contras," taking into account the President's right to veto legislative initiatives, and we must not forget the secret CIA channels -- hundreds of millions of dollars flow along them to Somozist camps. However, in any case the legislators' present move is very symbolic, for it reflects the opinion of the majority of Americans opposed to the interventionist policy of the White House in Central America.

TASS COMMENTS ON U.S. MANEUVERS IN HONDURAS

LD231816 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0417 GMT 23 Feb 87

[Andrey Zagorskiy commentary]

[Text] Moscow, 23 Feb (TASS) -- There has been an ominous increase of activity near Nicaragua's borders in the last few days. Several military maneuvers involving U.S. forces are being held simultaneously in Honduras. On Honduran territory alone are concentrated more than 4,500 warriors from the Pentagon, who are openly practicing invasion techniques. U.S. spy planes are continually darting in and out over Nicaragua, while -- as reported by the republic's Defense Ministry -- U.S. warships recently passed just 100 meters from the Nicaraguan coast

What is this -- a dress rehearsal for intervention? This cannot be ruled out, especially as the present mood of the White House, judging by, for example, the recent statement by the U.S. Secretary of State Shultz -- is highly adventuristic. But his new flare-up of militaristic displays could have another significance. We know that the plans for aggressive actions have been ready for a very long time and have been rehearsed by the Pentagon many times. It looks as if the White House, realizing that open aggression would spark a storm of indignation and protest, is trying to achieve its aims "bloodlessly." By blocking the peacemaking efforts of the Contadora Group and holding war games off Nicaragua's borders, the United States is endeavoring at all costs to force Managua to accept a "settlement" that is advantageous to Washington, envisaging what amounts to wiping out the gains of the Sandinista revolution.

The Nicaragua crisis did not arise today or yesterday. Washington has been artificially fanning it for a long time in an attempt to strangle the young republic. But the plans of the present administration, which has made confrontation with the Sandinista revolution almost a matter of honor, are invariably failing. One cannot but marvel that the United States still does not understand that blackmail and threat, and even more, reliance on military force, are the wrong tools for resolving the complex problems of the region, says the author of the commentary, Andrey Zagorskiy.

TURKATENKO: SHAMIR VISIT AIMS TO BOLSTER U.S.

LD201932 Moscow TASS in English 1850 GMT 20 Feb 87

[Text] Washington February 20 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko:

Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir has wound up the official part of his visit to the U.S. capital. Yet he is to stay another two or three days in the USA to meet with representatives of the pro-Israeli lobby, which is pressuring the U.S. Administration and Congress for even broader financial and military support for the Tel Aviv aggression against the Arab countries and the people of Palestine.

The Israeli premier was given a red carpet reception in Washington. He met with President Ronald Reagan, Secretary of State George Shultz, Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger, other leaders of the Administration and a number of Congress members. The talks pursued several aims. One of them was to discuss a fresh increase in the scope of the U.S. handouts for Israel, which is already now the biggest recipient of U.S. aid. Indeed, Shamir did not even have to go to Washington with the aim, since that issue is permanently kept under control by the pro-Israeli lobby and did not meet with any serious obstacles in that respect.

The main aim of Yitzhak Shamir's visit to Washington was to discuss what measures were to be taken to restore the prestige of the United States in the Middle East region, which has been severely damaged by the undercover U.S. arms shipments to Iran, a country at war with an Arab state -- Iraq. Shamir was also to help the White House hush up the Irangate scandal in the USA, since the exposures which resulted in "Irangate" proved to be a double blow to the U.S. Administration. They demonstrated the duplicity and mendacity of the Administration both in its foreign and home policy. The Administration acted not only in contravention of its own commitments and international law but also in violation of the U.S. laws and by detour of the Congress.

This is the point on which Shamir has something to discuss, and advise the pro-Israeli lobby in the USA that it should even more vigorously join in the campaign of masterminding the Congress members and the U.S. press, which official Washington's supporters also intends to participate in the "rescue operation" for which he expressed readiness to meet with members of the Tower Committee preparing a report on "Irangate".

While being in a hurry to "help out" the U.S. Administration, Israel, as Shamir's visit has shown, is nevertheless concerned most with his own interests, as the decline of the influence of its main "strategic ally" in the Middle East because of "Irangate" by no means helps towards a further broadening of the Israeli aggression in the Middle East. In setting the fashion for the game designed for the Arab countries, the Administration, as it seemed to it, resorted to a cunning manoeuvre.

After the meeting with Shamir, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz dropped a hint that neither the USA nor Israel excluded such an "option" of a Middle East settlement as the convocation of an international conference with the participation of all sides concerned, yet he put forward, in doing so, a number of his own terms. Thus he declared that such a conference should not be an obstacle to Israel's "bilateral contacts" with the Arab countries. In other words, the U.S. secretary of state seemed to have agreed to the convocation of an international conference, but simultaneously reaffirmed the commitment of the USA to continue assistance to Israel in its "diplomatic offensive" aimed at deepening the split and differences between the Arab countries. Yet Shamir did not go into the "subtleties" of the U.S. stand and outright declared that Israel would never agree to the convocation of an international conference on the Middle East if it envisages the participation of the Soviet Union and of the legitimate representatives of the people of Palestine along with the other sides concerned.

The Administration, which has to reckon with the pro-Israeli lobby, preferred not to comment on this stand of its client. So Washington has failed to take advantage of the visit of the Israeli prime minister specially organized in order to put a good face on what is going on in the Middle East.

COMMENTARY CRITICIZES U.S. HUMAN RIGHTS REPORT

LD202129 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 20 Feb 87

[Vitaliy Sobolev commentary]

[Text] The U.S. State Department has published the latest report on the condition of human rights in various countries in the world. Its main idea has been expressed thus: In democratic -- read bourgeois -- countries there are virtually no serious violations of human rights, but in undemocratic countries -- of which the Soviet Union is one in the opinion of the authors of the report -- the state of human rights ranges from bad to terrible. In our latest news commentary, Vitaliy Sobolev is at the microphone:

[Sobolev] There are both eulogies and accusations cribbed from previous such documents in t his report. There is nothing new in it, and this is perhaps the most sad and alarming aspect. The report has been compiled by a department charged with conducting U.S. foreign policy and the document states bluntly that this policy will depend on the evaluations given in it.

It is hardly worth investing a lot of effort in refuting these evaluations. As people who live in glass houses should not throw stones, it would be worthwhile for the authors of the report to count how many campaigners for the rights of national minorities, human rights, and activists of the peace movement there are in U.S. prisons. Americans themselves believe the unemployed and homeless have not been counted up fully by the U.S. governmental services.

In present international relations one must not address, and it is dangerous to address, the whole world from the position of a self-styled supreme judge. Respect for others combined with an objective, self-critical view of one's own society are essential. This thought was stressed by Comrade Gorbachev when he addressed the participants of the Forum for a Nuclear-free World and the Survival of Humanity. He drew the attention of the audience to the reforms, including the development of democracy in our country, reforms from which only the whole world can gain. The new approach in the Soviet Union to humanitarian problems is another result of the new thinking, highly essential to those on whom the state of relations between states depends. Soviet foreign policy, like its domestic policy, gives an expressive example of such thinking.

Judging by the State Department's report one could think that there they simply have not noticed all this, if that is the case. There are more grounds for concluding that they have indeed noticed and that immediately after the Moscow forum they have offered their people and the whole world a model of the oldest thinking there is, the thinking that constitutes in itself a serious assassination attempt not only on the rights of Americans, but on all people on earth.

In pronouncing an unjust and unlawful sentence on other countries in the report, the self-styled judges and architects of U.S. foreign policy want to prove their right to punish billions of people. Well, people can compare what they hear from Moscow and Washington. In understanding their rights they have the least need for the instructions of the State Department which as we see is living by old notions.

7TH ROUND OF AFGHAN-PAKISTAN GENEVA TALKS OPENS

LD251541 Moscow TASS in English 1434 GMT 25 Feb 87

[Text] Geneva February 25 TASS -- The seventh round of the Afghan-Pakistani talks held through the personal representative of the U.N. secretary-general, Cordoves, resumed at the Geneva Palace of Nations today. The Afghan delegation at the talks is led by 'Abdol Wakil, Afghanistan's foreign affairs minister, and that of Pakistan by Sahiabzade Yaqub Khan, Pakistan's foreign affairs minister.

The Afghan foreign affairs minister, 'Abdol Wakil, told the press conference here on Tuesday that the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan was prepared to hold constructive negotiations to work out a quick political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan.

Najibullah TV Speech

LD252048 Moscow TASS in English 2020 GMT 25 Feb 87

[Text] Kabul February 25 TASS -- "We have opened the door to everyone for reaching an accord on reconciliation. Today I am stating once again that we are prepared to discuss specific proposals with representatives of opposition groups on the composition of a coalition government".

"Such a meeting can be held in Kabul or any neutral country", stated Najib, general secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA), appearing on television today in connection with the Afghan-Pakistani talks which resume in Geneva.

"It must be recalled", he went on to say, "that the present government includes four ministers of former regimes, as well as 35 non-party people. Several former leaders of bands are now at the head of districts and regions. This is a real example of the pursuance of the reconciliation policy in practice".

"The reconciliation policy enables Afghan refugees to return to their homes. Today tens of thousands of refugees are already back at home. Their return most fully expresses the timeliness and humane nature of the reconciliation. The native land greets them warmly and cordially and shares housing, land, water and bread with them".

"The government renders the necessary material assistance to every family and every person, allocating money and providing food and prime necessities".

"We honestly fulfil the lofty obligations under the declaration on national reconciliation. Despite the unilateral cessation of fire by us, the enemy continues bombardment and still commits terrorist acts in a number of areas of the country. However, we do not yield to the provocations of those who seek to frustrate the reconcilation."

"Various aspects of a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan will be discussed in Geneva. A certain progress was achieved during the previous rounds. However, some important issues still remain undecided".

"We are looking with hope and optimism at the prospects for solving them, and are convinced that at the present stage it is quite realistic to achieve mutually acceptable accords on the entire range of issues".

"We are firmly resolved to steer matters towards achieving peace on Afghan soil as soon as possible. We are introducing substantial adjustments to the revolutionary process in a bid to make it more humane and more acceptable in the specific conditions of the peasant multi-nation country which has complex inter-tribal relationships."

Wakil Interviewed

LD262212 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 26 Feb 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by correspondent V. Dmitriyev, identified by screen caption, including an interview with 'Abdol Wakil, DRA's minister of foreign affairs. Wakil is speaking in vernacular with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Announcer] A news conference has been given in Geneva by 'Abdol Wakil, Afghanistan's minister of foreign affairs, in connection with the start of the latest round of Afghan-Pakistani talks under the auspices of the United Nations. [video shows Wakil addressing journalists]

[Dmitriyev] There is enormous interest in Afghanistan, the program that has been declared by that country's government for reconciliation and the Afghan-Pakistani talks in Geneva. This was shown by the numerous questions from correspondents of the world's major newspapers and television and radio companies, which were given exhaustive replies:

[Wakil] The unilateral cease-fire for 6 months that has been proclaimed by our government is the first step on the way to restoring peace and carrying out the national reconciliation program in Afghanistan. This program accords with the vital interests of our people. [video shows Wakil giving interview]

Since the proclamation of the declaration on national reconciliation over 25,000 Afghans, who for various reasons had previously left the country, have returned home. The Afghan leadership has stated quite definitely its readiness to form a coalition government, but imperialist and reactionary forces headed by the United States, who were taken unawares by our initiative, are in every way hampering our efforts to achieve accord. While our government has been strictly observing the truce, the extremist opposition groups have been violating it.

As you know, six Soviet regiments were recently withdrawn from Afghanistan, and as Comrade Gorbachev stated at the Moscow international forum, the Soviet Union will recall the whole of its military contingent in as short a time as possible. However, a solution of this problem requires reciprocity on the part of the United States and Afghanistan's neighbors and also international efforts. We are hoping for a successful completion of the present round of Afghan-Pakistani talks.

Falin Interviewed

AU261807 Vienna Domestic Service in German 1700 25 Feb 87

[Interview with Valentin Falin, director of Novosti, by Raimund Loew in Vienna; date not given -- recorded in German]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Loew] Mr Ambassador, today the talks between the governments in Kabul and Pakistan were resumed in Geneva through the mediation of the United Nations. Will there be -- on the basis of information available to you -- new proposals for a withdrawal of the Russian troops and, first and foremost, will there be a new time schedule?

[Falin] The withdrawal of the Soviet troops is part of the problem, it is not the gist of the issue. There exist new ideas concerning this subject. There will be absolute flexibility on the Afghan side and we understand and support this position. We would like to achieve the earliest possible solution to the problem. We do not want to maintain a military presence in Afghanistan, a neutral, nonaligned state, which will be a good friend of the Soviet Union.

[Loew] How do you see the withdrawal in terms of time; will it require months or years?

[Falin] I would say that if the guarantees are given that the country has the right to solve its own problems without outside interference, we can speak of months and not of years.

AFGHAN ARMY SPOKESMAN ON CEASE-FIRE OBSERVANCE

LD241402 Moscow TASS in English 1324 GMT 24 Feb 87

[Text] Kabul February 24 TASS -- In spite of armed actions of the forces that are hostile to the Afghan people, the process of national reconciliation is gaining momentum in the country, APN correspondent Boris Gan was told by Colonel Abdul Wahed [name as received], a spokesmen for the general headquarters of the Afghan Army. A total of 690 emergency reconciliation commissions have been set up with the participation of elders, clergymen and tribal chiefs in all the districts and provinces of the country. They are holding talks with armed rebels, supply applications for the amnesty of prisoners and provide relief to refugees returning home. A truce is observed by the Afghan Army and opposition in the larger part of the country's territory. There have been no ceasefire violations in the north of the country and in most areas of the north-west, north-east and south-west, Colonel Wahed said.

Where the truce is being observed, troops are rehabilitating war-ravaged civilian projects, such as schools, hospitals, mosques and irrigation systems, and also remove mines from roads and fields. Army troops distribute relief to returning refugees and render health care aid to the population. However, in the east and south-east, in the Khowst district of Paktia Province and in Qandahar Province, that is, in the areas especially close to the headquarters of the dushmans in Pakistani territory, the armed opposition has not respected the truce at all.

In this situation the authorities and army troops have to return fire. This is self-defense rather than violations of the truce by the Armed Forces of the Democratic Republic. National reconciliation is gaining nomentum in Afghanistan. According to Colonel Wahed, while about 12,000 members of armed groupings laid down arms in the whole of last year, the fiture last month alone was about 15,000. More than 100 armed groupings are now holding talks on the condition of their going over to the side of the authorities.

Some 30,000 Afghan refugees returned home during the seven-year underclared war, whereas the figure last January was 20,000. Conditions for the elections of opposition members to local bodies of government have been provided in many parts of the country, where there is peace and where armed struggle has been totally terminated. True, Colonel Wahed said, the process of national reconciliation is still beset with difficulties. Terrorists have grown more active in some parts of the country. A plane carrying 36 passengers was shot down in Jalalabad and booby trapped toys have been planted. Members of the emergency reconciliation commissions in Konduz, Nangarhar and Qandarhar Provinces have been killed by terrorists. All this is being done with the quite definite purpose of sowing fear among the civilian population and making it reject the government's course of national reconciliation. But these attempts are clearly doomed because the Afghan people are energetically working for peace in their homeland.

NAJIBULLAH ADDRESSES SOVIET ANNIVERSARY MEETING

LD232114 Moscow TASS in English 1858 GMT 23 Feb 87

[Text] Kabul February 23 TASS -- The development of political and economic ties between the Soviet Union and Afghanistan forms the basis for the policy of national reconciliation conducted by the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, said General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan Najib. He addressed a celebration meeting here today devoted to the 69th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy Day.

The general secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan said that 40 armed groups with a total numerical strength of over eight thousand have already taken the side of the people's power. More than 20 thousand former refugees returned to Afghanistan from abroad. But the main result of the policy of national reconciliation is that it has shaken the positions of the opposing camp. Forces are differentiated there and it becomes clear who is for peace and who is against.

The majority of people has chosen the road to peace, the Afghan leader said. But there are yet many difficulties in this road. At the same time these complexities should not disturb us. We are now more confident than ever. We intend to take shortly new steps in our peace drive.

As to those who have not ceased fire, we shall be dealing strikes at them, to crush these extremists, said the general secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan.

GROSSU DELEGATION ENDS MOZAMBIQUE VISIT

PM231445 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Feb 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Visit Ends"]

[Text] Maputo, 18 Feb -- The CPSU delegation headed by S.K. Grossu, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, which has been here at the invitation of the Mozambique Liberation Front (Frelimo), left for home today. The delegation was seen off at Maputo airport by Jose Luis Cabaco, member of the Frelimo Central Committee and deputy secretary of the party Central Committee for foreign relations. Before leaving, the CPSU delegation head expressed deep appreciation to the Frelimo leadership and the entire Mozambique people for their kindness and hospitality.

On the last day of its stay in Maputo the CPSU delegation had a meeting with Jorge Rebelo, member of the Frelimo Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the party Central Committee. During the conversation the results of the CPSU delegation's visit were summed up and the situation in Southern Africa was examined.

EGYPT'S GHALI RECEIVES VISITING USSR DELEGATION

PM231649 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Talks Under Way"]

[Text] Cairo, 21 Feb -- The USSR UN Association delegation headed by O.C. Peresypkin, member of the association's board, which is on a visit here has been received by Butrus Ghali, Egyptian minister of state for foreign affairs. During the talk the sides expressed the desire to promote efforts aimed at strengthening peace and international security, resolving regional conflicts by political means, and developing mutual understanding among the peoples. Particular mention was made of the situation in the Near East and ways of settling it. Attention was drawn to M.S. Gorbachev's statement on this question in his speech to participants in the Moscow international forum "For A Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity.

The Soviet delegation is holding talks on questions of developing cooperation with the Egyptian UN Association.

GEYVANDOV PONDERS LEBANESE EVENTS, U.S. REACTION

PM251331 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Feb 87 Morning Edition pp 4-5

[Konstantin Geyvandov "Political Observer's Opinion": "Vicious Circle of Violence"]

[Text] This week the reports of a major naval armada concentrated by the U.S. Administration in the eastern Mediterranean were virtually pushed into the background by the tragic events around the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon blockaded from the land and subjected to bombardment from air and sea, and by the armed clashes in Beirut. However, this by no means signifies that the threat from the U.S. 6th Fleet has diminished. ABC TV reported that "virtually everything needed has been prepared for inflicting a strike -- and a swift one at that -- if even a single Americn hostage is killed in Lebanon. [paragraph continues]

Sources have reported that every necessary measure has been taken in the military and intelligence spheres and from the viewpoint of preparing public opinion."

What does this mean specifically? No secret is made of that either. Two carrier groups headed by the Nimitz and the John F. Kennedy continue to maneuver off Lebanon. It is planned that when the carrier John F. Kennedy returns home in March it will be replaced by another carrier -- the Kitty Hawk. They need it to ensure that they are ready to strike at any moment with the force of at least 2 aircraft carriers, whose total combat might run to 170 aircraft. However, the Pentagon considers it most important of all that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have drawn up a comprehensive list of targets in Lebanon against which it is planned to strike with this might. And U.S. Secretary of State Shultz explained to everyone beforehand why the Lebanese populace bears "collective responsibility" for what is happening in the country under the conditions of the Israeli aggression and the civil war.

Terrorism is a terrible evil and a real disaster -- there are no two ways about it. An uncompromising struggle must be waged against it. But why, one wonders, should an entire people and state be "punished" for the rash actions of a group of extremists? After all, it is obvious that those who try to "fight" terrorism with terrorism -- but terrorism elevated to the level of state policy -- are committing an even greater crime. There can, I believe, be no two opinions on that score. An even greater number of innocent human beings, state sovereignty, and international law will be the victims in that case. At the same time all the norms of morality and justice are flouted. Thus, a vicious circle of violence and bloodshed emerges.

It can never be broken when attempts are made by aircraft carriers to extirpate the effects while doing nothing to eradicate the fundamental causes at the root of the phenomenon. There is no doubt that terrorism originating in the Near East is the ugly outcome of the long-standing Arab-Israeli conflict. And today few people can be unaware of the reasons that brought that conflict about and continue to prevent its resolution. These reasons include the flouting by the United States and its closest allies of the inalienable legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine and the other peoples of the region, the interference in their internal affairs, and the intrigues, threats, and subversive operations aimed at destabilizing disliked governments, subordinating others to their interests, and ordering them about.

Incidentally, this is virtually the entire "panoply" of reasons for the numerous regional conflicts that have emerged as a result of the activities of the U.S. Administration and its most devoted allies in various parts of the world and are creating constant tension in the international arena, along with the continuing nuclear arms race and the desire to transfer it to space. A theoretical underpinning, termed the "neoglobalism" doctrine or the "Reagan doctrine," has even been provided for the implementation of this policy which runs counter to mankind's fundamental interests.

There is nothing surprising in the fact that this policy nearly always gives rise to double standards and, put simply, to a distortion of any forms of morality and justice, when the criteria applied to some are diametrically opposed to the assessments made of the actions and acts of others. Thus, the U.S. Administration has already developed a kind of knee-jerk reaction to the actions of the extremists who have taken U.S. and other countries' citizens hostage in Lebanon. They are unhesitatingly called terrorists. [paragraph continues]

Here is a characteristic fact: For the last few months a U.S. ally -- the Israeli military -- has intercepted on the high seas 20 ships en route from Cyprus to Lebanon, disembarked dozens of passengers from them, and interned them without trial or investigation in Tel Aviv torture chambers. But when U.S. State Department spokesman P. Oakley was asked the other day whether Washington also described these actions as terrorism, she answered: "We have not yet reached a final conclusion."

Thus it is obvious even from a cursory examination that the concentration of U.S. military might in the eastern Mediterranean has nothing to do with the real battle against terrorism. It is aimed to resolving the same old imperial tasks of the U.S. Administration formulated in the "new globalism" doctrine. The implementation of these tasks is intended to serve to further whip up the Near East conflict rather than resolve it. The interests of the so-called U.S. friends and allies in the region are the last thing to be taken into consideration or are even disregarded totally. During a recent trip to Israel, for instance, I saw for myself the growing realization of this truth among that country's public. In conversation I repeatedly heard it said, in particular, that the struggle for peace and a just Near East settlement rather than a blind toeing of the line of U.S. policy accords with the Israeli people's strategic interests and guarantees the survival of the state of Israel.

Yes, a just settlement of the Near East crisis and other regional conflicts is the urgent demand of the present day. And the Soviet Union is striving to make its own weighty contribution to implementing that aim by drawing up a comprehensive program for an all-embracing resolution of the task. The proposal to create a preparatory committee within the UN Security Council framework to convene an international peace conference on the Near East is part and parcel of it. The topicality of this initiative is confirmed by the widespread support for it from the world community, including the UN General Assembly and the nonaligned and Muslim countries at conferences in Harare and Kuwait.

The easing of tension in the Mediterranean would undoubtedly be promoted by the practical implementation of another package of Soviet initiatives aimed at turning the region into a zone of lasting peace, security, and cooperation; in particular by the proposal for a U.S. and Soviet naval withdrawal from the Mediterranean. And the argument here is extremely simple and clear. The Soviet Union has no need in principle to maintain naval forces in the Mediterranean on a permanent basis. It is mainly a preventive measure linked with the fact that the U.S. 6th Fleet, equipped with nuclear missile weapons, is in direct proximity to Soviet borders. And if the United States, which is situated thousands of miles away from the Mediterranean, withdrew its Navy, the Soviet Union could simultaneously do likewise.

A just political settlement of regional conflicts is dictated by the same logic of an interdependent and integral world which requires solutions to other global problems too. As was shown by the international forum For A Nuclear-Free World, For the Survival of Humanity held in Moscow the other day - a forum I attended -- this logical thinking is today adhered to by the broadest world public circles. Is there a chance that official Washington will join in this thinking too? Let us wait and see, as the saying goes. One thing is clear -- the vicious circle of violence and bloodshed must be destroyed.

ETHIOPIAN DEFENSE MINISTER TO VISIT IN MARCH

LD261044 Moscow TASS in English 1025 GMT 26 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 26 TASS -- Lieutenant General Tesfaye Gebre-Kidan, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Ethiopia and national defence minister, will come to the Soviet Union on an official visit in the first half of March at the invitation of Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Sokolov, alternate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR defence minister.

S. AFRICAN GOVERNMENT-ANC RELATIONS VIEWED

MB161758 Moscow in Afrikaans to South Africa 1745 GMT 13 Feb 87

[Commentary by Vladimir Valentinov]

[Text] There was a meeting recently between ANC [African National Congress] President Oliver Tambo and the U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz in the United States. Mr Shultz declared during this meeting that the ANC's armed struggle against apartheid is an obstacle to the resolution of South African problems. The racist circles in South Africa also say the same thing, and demand that the ANC should renounce violence so that talks on the future of South Africa can be held.

Naturally, it is better to resolve problems peacefully than by means of war or violence. The ANC has demanded since its establishment in 1912 until the beginning of the 1960's that South African problems be resolved peacefully. The leaders of the ANC, the oldest liberation organization in Africa, supported a nonviolent struggle during these years. They were trying to peacefully resolve the racist situation in the country and hoped that they could convince the racist government to democratize society, but all attempts were in vain.

The futility of this strategy became apparent after the Nationalist government came to power in 1948. This regime took no interest in the ANC's peaceful policy, and the organization was banned. Many of its leaders, like Nelson Mandela, were imprisoned. It then became clear to the millions of blacks that peaceful negotiations would not bring freedom. The ANC was forced to take up arms.

On 16 December 1961, the military wing of the ANC [Umkhonto We Sizwe -- spear of the nation] was formed to lauch military action in different parts of the country. Today the armed struggle has intensified, and Umkhonto We Sizwe has played an important role in these events. The regime is feeling these attacks.

The racists now acknowledge that their government is in danger and are trying different ways of neutralizing and isolating the ANC and Umkhonto We Sizwe. One of these is the demand by Pretoria and its U.S. supporters that the ANC should renounce violence if talks are to be held.

The racists should not forget that they forced the ANC into the armed struggle. The ANC president, Comrade Oliver Tambo, declared that as long as the racist regime is not prepared to resolve the South African problem peacefully, the ANC will continue with the armed struggle.

AFRICAN PETROLEUM PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION FOUNDED

PM111043 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Candidate of Economic Sciences I. Yermachenkov commentary under the rubric "Expert Opinion": "'Black Gold' and APPA"]

[Excerpts] The constituent conference of the African Petroleum Producers Association [APPA] was held in Lagos recently at the level of petroleum ministers and ended with the adoption of the statutes and the establishment of the new African organization. Its founding members are eight -- Algeria, Angola, Benin, Cameroon, Congo, Gabon, Libya, and Nigeria. B. Nabi, the Algerian minister of energy, was elected the association's president. [passage omitted]

During the conference in Lagos, the petroleum ministers discussed questions pertaining to the establishment of allied enterprises in the association's countries, exchanges of technology, and training of specialists. They also examined legal questions closely connected with the tasks of the OAU and OPEC.

During the preparations for the Lagos conference and while it was underway, Western countries and their petroleum monopolies tried to drive a wedge between the Arab and African petroleum-producing countries. They claimed in particular that the APPA would undermine the unity of OPEC and disunite its members. Rejecting these conjectures, R. Lukman, Nigerian minister of petroleum resources, who has been elected president of OPEC, declared that the APPA will in no way undermine the unity of OPEC and will, on the contrary, contribute to a more fruitful dialogue between the organization and petroleum-producing countries which are not its members.

In the Soviet Union the news from Lagos about the establishment of the new African organization, whose aims are to consolidate the economic independence of African petroleum producers on the one hand, and to promote their desire to manage their national resources on their own on the other hand, was received with understanding and support.

DEMICHEV RECEIVES JAMAICAN ENVOY, HOLDS TALKS

PM111125 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Credentials Presented"]

[Text] In the Kremlin on 9 February, Glaister George Duncan, Jamaican ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary, presented his credentials to P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

After the presentation of credentials and an exchange of speeches, friendly talks took place between P.N. Demichev and G.G. Duncan in which T.N. Metneshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and V.M. Nikiforov, USSR deptuy foreign minister, participated.

ORTEGA RALLY ADDRESS ON U.S. 'AGGRESSIVE' POLICY

LD271028 Moscow TASS in English 0823 GMT 27 Feb 87

[Text] Managua February 27 TASS -- The United States' move to impose a sea blockade of Nicaragua is a prelude to direct armed intervention against the republic, President Daniel Ortega of Nicaragua said in Masaya Thursday.

Addressing a mass rally there, Ortega said that the U.S. administration did not abandon the attempts to strangle the Sandinist people's revolution which had become a symbol of the aspirations by all Latin American peoples for national liberation and independence.

In pursuing the aggressive policy towards Nicaragua, Washington makes every effort to stymie the process of the settlement of the Central American crisis. The Nicaraguan leader voiced support for the Contadora Group's bids to bring peace to the region and declared Nicaragua's wish to live in peace with all states.

EL SALVADOR U.S. 'PUPPET', 'ANTIPEOPLE' REGIME

PM251635 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Feb 87 First Edition p 3

[A. Petrukhin article: "Washington's Puppet Will Never Defeat the Patriotic Rebels"]

[Text] THE NEW YORK TIMES recently published an article on the situation in El Salvador. This is the conclusion drawn by the author: "It is the general opinion that almost 3 years in power have shown President Duarte to be a weak national leader; the public's trust in him and the Army's support have reached their nadir. In view of the continuing support of the United States and its Armed Forces, it is unlikely that Duarte will be removed from power. But few informed observers believe he has political authority." What is the reason for the pro-American regime's pitiable position, which is now even being admitted by the U.S. press?

For more than 5 years, reports on El Salvador, the smallest country in Central America, have been constantly featured in the world press. A war is being waged between patriotic forces, united by the Farabundo Marti National Front (FMLN) and the Democratic Revolutionary Front (FDR), and the reactionary regime of the U.S. protege Jose Napolean Duarte. More than 60,000 people have been killed in 6 years. Washington's puppets have turned the country into a vast concentration camp and many women, children, and old people have been among those who have died. Thousands of Salvadorans have disappeared without trace. Hunger, unemployment, disease, and lawlessness are the results of the antipeople regime's activities.

Who is to blame for the fact that this tragedy is still continuing? Washington, without doubt. Every day El Salvador's rulers receive $1.5 million in "aid" from the United States, mainly used for military purposes.

But an interesting report appeared in the U.S. press recently. An air company belonging to the CIA secretly delivered a 400-ton load to the military base in the Salvadoran town of Ilopango. All this, U.S. journalists believe, shows that this is how weapons are being supplied to the Duarte regime. [paragraph continues]

U.S. instructors, whose number is constantly growing, train soldiers to kill partisans. The Salvadoran Armed Forces have increased from 12,000 to 60,000 in 6 years.

Washington seems to have created all the conditions to defeat the patriotic forces. But the FMLN is winning one encounter after another.

The U.S. Administration is doing its utmost to conceal the failure of its adventurist policy in El Salvador. But murder will out. The truth that the $1.5 million sent to the Duarte regime every day are stained with the blood of women and children is even getting through to the United States. This is arousing shame and indignation among honest Americans. A recent statement by Ronald Dellums, an influential member of Congress who protested the escalation in military interference in El Salvador's civil war, is highly revealing: "We followed this same said road," he recalled, "in Southeast Asia. We cannot allow the government to take this path again."

It is common knowledge that if it were not for U.S. support, the Duarte regime would have been swept away long ago. The question arises: Why is Washington interfering in the internal affairs of a Central American republic? Does the latter really pose a danger to this mighty power? It seems that it does. The insurgent Salvadoran people, who are fighting for their future, are very dangerous to the U.S. powers-that-be. The idea of a new Cuba or a new Nicaragua scares them to death. That is why Washington has declared this little country to be within its zone of influence, while bourgeois propaganda repeates its story of the "hand of Moscow" and the "hand of Havana," which, it says, want to seize El Salvador (no less!) and set up... a bridgehead from which to attack the United States. Insanity? No question. But using this propaganda rubbish makes it easier to extort money from the pockets of U.S. taxpayers to give as aid to the puppet regime.

Of course, the U.S. Administration turns a blind eye to the fact that the regime it favors and nurtures is pursuing a policy of genocide against its own people. On the other hand, it seizes every opportunity -- however farfetched -- to accuse the FMLN and FDR leadership of being reluctant to end the fratricidal war. The facts are turned upside down. But, as everyone knows, facts are stubborn things and they show that the patriots have suggested more than once solving the problems by peaceful means, without any preconditions. The rebels have often decided to break off combat operations during national and religious festivals. The same also applied during the recent devastating earthquake. And the authorities? What was their reaaction to these signs of good will? It was as negative as it possibly could be. What is more, the regime is trying to use the unilateral cease-fire by the revolutionary forces to stab them in the back. And so the FMLN has been forced to take up arms again.

Objective observers in the West do not believe fabrications that the partisans are aggressive and out for blood. Over the last 6 years the rebel camps have been visited by journalists from all over the world. Even known enemies of the FMLN have been forced to admit that the partisans are not being guided by any "hand" of Moscow or Havana. Poverty, lawlessness, and terror force the rebels to take up arms. Journalists have observed that discipline prevails in the partisan camps and that the fighters are distinguished by a high degree of awareness. They also have drawn attention to the fact that the patriots are supported by the majority of the people. This is the main reason why the dictatorship is unable to gain the upper hand over the revolutionary forces.

I have been fortunate enough to meet with the Salvadoran patriots, members of the underground, and fighters in the rebel army. Most of them are young people. They live a dangerous, complicated life. They lose comrades-in-arms every day and have themselves looked death in the face more than once. But I cannot remember a single occasion when these people complained of their difficulties or fell into despair. "We will most definitely win," they said, "because we have the truth of history on our side. You cannot defeat a people who have taken up arms."

El Salvador's patriotic forces are doing much at present to strengthen their ranks and unity. The FMLN and FDR recently concluded a strategic alliance whose aim is to fight for the triumph of a democratic, anti-oligarchical, and anti-imperialist revolution and establish a political power in El Salvador which will defend national interests.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON KOMPLEKTOV 9-10 FEB MEETING

PM131651 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Consultations Held"]

[Text] Mexico City, 11 Feb -- Soviet-Mexican political consultations were held here on 9-10 February. Taking part were: V.G. Komplektov, USSR deputy foreign minister, Alfonso de Rosenzweig Diaz, acting Mexican foreign secretary, and also Victor Flores Olea, Mexican foreign under secretary.

V.G. Komplektov had meetings with Luis Bravo (Agiler), Mexican under secretary of commerce and industrial development, and Jose Luis Alcudia, Mexican under secretary of energy, mines, and parastate industry.

Issues relating to the further development of friendly Soviet-Mexican relations were discussed during a meeting with a group of senators -- members of the National Congress Upper Chamber Foreign Affairs Commission -- headed by Patrocinio Gonzalez Blanco, chairman of the commission.

GORBACHEV ADDRESSES 18TH AUCCTU CONGRESS

LD251836 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0701 GMT 25 Feb 87

[Speech by CPSU General Secretary Gorbachev to the 18th AUCCTU Congress at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow -- live]

[Text] Comrades, on behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, I greet your congress and through you I greet all the working people of the land of soviets.

Exactly a year ago, on February 25, the 27th Congress of the CPSU began its work here in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. The congress has proved a turning point in the destiny of our homeland and for the future of socialism. It broadly and boldly reviewed the experience gained in building and new society and worked out a mobilizing policy for accelerated socioeconomic development throughout the country and for work toward the ideals of peace and humanism.

A month ago we had a January plenary meeting of the party's Central Committee. That plenum substantially deepened our awareness of the situation that has developed, specified the tasks in reorganizing all the political activites of the party and people, elaborated a detailed concept for the democratization of social life, and gave a powerful impetus to the process of throwing off everything that still hampers revolutionary transformations.

A meeting with the participants in the Forum For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity was held in the Kremlin slightly more than a week ago. As you know, the political and ethical principles of the foreign-policy strategy of the Soviet Union and its approach to the global problems of mankind, notably the priority of preserving life on earth, were set out before an authoritative and widely representative audience.

These events reflect the mighty rhythm of our times -- a period of great undertakings, re-evaluation and growing hopes, social enthusiasm and uncompromising struggle between the new and the old. This is a difficult time but an unusually interesting one, a time when the society is gaining confidence in its strength, a time of civil maturation and patriotic noncomplacency of people. We are confident that the practical work of your congress and the decisions taken by it likewise will be imbued with the spirit of our times.

A year is, on the whole, a brief period, but the past year saw very much from the viewpoint of social significance. At the same time we now realize that only the very first steps have been made. The main thing, and hence the most difficult, still lies ahead. Up to now we mainly have been preparing for reorganization: We were working out its strategy, mapping out the main ways, identifying everything that was a hindrance and called for adjustment, and determining positions of departure. It is now time to get the reorganization actually moving. The year 1987 will be determinant, in many respects, for the fate of the reorganization effectually is being decided now and the foundation for acceleration is being laid.

As was emphasised at the January plenum of the Central Committee, the reorganization is reality, and no longer an idea. It is taking hold in the minds of people, which means it works; it works for socialism, for the renewal of our society. We are not building from scratch; one cannot build anything worthwhile starting from scratch. We have something to be proud of and to rely upon. We have great values, which we place above everything else. Behind us, we have the greatest of revolutions, one which abruptly changed the course of events both in our country and in the world, and made an indelible imprint on the destinies of mankind.

Behind us we have vast and diverse experience, which has not yet been fully assessed, in building socialism in practice -- experience to which one must constantly turn, learning to solve problems as they arise, in the Leninist way. Behind us we have tremendous economic, scientific, technical and intellectual potentials created and multiplied by the energies and talents of all the peoples of our great country.

Yes, comrades, we have traversed a long path, a difficult and heroic one, but through all the ordeals we have carried the revolutionary spirit of the people, with faith in socialism and its supreme justice. We have coped with and overcome everything. We have managed an unprecedented advance from the wooden plow and the light-giving splinter to space flights. We have experienced an incomparable joy: The joy of great accomplishments.

The indissoluble connection between work and civic concern for the common good, which brings together all generations of Soviet people, our patriotism, working-class pride, labor enthusiasm, and the sacred feeling of belonging to the great cause of the October Revolution, all these are the mammoth gains of our system without which it is simply inconceivable. It is precisely the working-man -- and first of all the working class, with its devotion to revolutionary traditions -- that is the principal motive force in today's transformations. Industriousness has always been the supreme ethical value of our people, and mastery invariably has been one of man's chief virtues.

Today, too, we have true experts, people to look up to and live up to. These are the like of Vladimir Matveyevich Gvozdev, team leader at the Raspadskaya Mine of the Yuzhkuzbassugol Association of Kemerovo Region; Nina Nikolayevna Shcherbakova, a weaver at Moscow's Tryokhgornaya Manufaktura Cotton Mill; Vakjno Aleksandrovich Saar, team leader at the Tallinnstroj building trust; Razifa Salikhanovna Khanova, a milkmaid at the Karl Marx Kolkhoz in the Bashkir ASSR; Valeriy Makarovich Kolesnikov, a rolling-mill operator at the Kuznetsk metallurgical complex; and Yevgeniy Petrovich Razmyatov, leader of a multiskill team at the Petropavlosk-Kamchatskiy commercial port. These and thousands of other names have been brought forth by our time of revolutionary acceleration. The country refers to them as Stakhanovites of reorganization, and fair enough, I should say. We have such people everywhere, in many work collectives. It is essential to ensure the daily increase of the number of those who work by means of innovatory and conscientious labor -- rather than mere words and assurances -- for the renewal of society and the reorganization.

Of course, we all want changes for the better as soon as possible. The lofty goals the party has put forward and the growing changes in the economic, social, and political spheres have resulted in what may be termed a revolution of expectations. Many want speedy social and material returns. I can judge this from recent meetings with the working people of Latvia and Estonia. Let us be frank, comrades. We can achieve acceleration and better quality for our entire life in only one way: Through effective and highly productive work. No mechanisms of distribution or redistribution can create anything by themselves. Yes, we need to refine many things in the national economic management system and in the social, political, and ideological spheres. As you know, such work is being conducted and will be conducted in the future as well, but there must be more emphasis on labor ethics as a whole.

The January plenary meeting of the Central Committee directly mentioned the responsibility of the party and of its leading bodies for the state of affairs in the country, but surely, this is only one aspect of the matter, albeit a very important one. Yet there is another aspect, too:

It is not secret to anyone that many were content and some still remain happy to work in a slipshod manner, with unearned pay, undeserved bonuses, a mutually undemanding atmosphere, lack of control, and irresponsibility. It must be clear: Time, efforts, and practical actions are needed for our legitimate material and social expectations to come true. Reorganization implies an increase in everyone's work efficiency, be he worker, collective farmer, office staffer, engineer, scientist, teacher, government minister, or party official. By no means everywhere and always to things stand in precisely this way.

When evaluating at the January plenary meeting of the Central Committee the positive changes achieved last year, we said that they reflected the Soviet people's powerful support for party policy and for the party's course towards reorganization. However, the beginning of the year has shown that the positive changes have not become a steady tendency of economic development. Difficulties in the metallurgical, chemical, and electronics industries grew from the second half of the last year but were not given proper attention in ministries, in the USSR State Planning Committee, or in the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply. The workers at many enterprises in these sectors did not set about correcting the situation in time. The results of January showed that in both the center and provinces many people did not prepare themselves properly for work under conditions of enhanced demands on the activity of enterprises and amalgamations given full-scale transition to new methods of economic management. The situation is being rectified now, but the process is slow. The party central committee counts on the understanding of the working class and all working people of the significance of the moment, of the importance of the successful implementation of the projected plans for the cause of acceleration, and on the growing contribution to economic development.

Today we want to alter radically the atmosphere in society, for we cannot be pleased with how we lived and worked previously. Nothing will come of it if we do not completely break the forces of inertia and deceleration, which are dangerous in their ability to draw the country back again into stagnation and dormancy, into the menacing congealment of society and social corrosion.

Here, I would like to touch once again upon the purport of the January plenum. We had an April plenary meeting in 1985 and, of course, it was not a fortuitous phenomenon. That plenum succeeded in expressing what was being thought and what was welling up in the country. It critically analysed the state of affairs in society and called for the elaboration of a concept of acceleration. When we saw the reaction by the party and by the people to the ideas of the April plenum, we became convinced that we had taken the correct path.

Following the April plenum, we held in June a large-scale meeting on matters concerning scientific and technological progress. As a result of that meeting, we worked out important programs for machine-building and a number of other branches of the national economy, and planned out measures to refine the management machinery, including those for running groups of interconnected sectors of the economy. All that was the starting point for giving shape, on the basis of the April plenum, to the concept outlined by the 27th congress. The concept is known to you, comrades. Following the congress, there arose the task of putting the strategic line towards acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development on the plane of practical work. Previously, as you know, quite a number of good decisions aimed at advancing the economy were made, but they often remained unfulfilled.

The CPSU Central Committee was aware that there would be no acceleration if we did not start to reorganize societal life and make healthier the entire atmosphere in the party and community.

It was at that time the question arose of preparing a plenary meeting of the central committee to work out a theory of reorganization and to determine the tasks of the personnel policy at the new stage.

Such was the main thrust of the January plenum, but to prepare it proved a difficult matter. Suffice to say that we postponed the beginning of the plenum three times, for we could not hold it without having a clear idea of the main issues. We were to deepen the analysis of the situation that had preceded the April plenary meeting and to draw lessons from it. The most important thing was to suggest what should be done for the reorganization to proceed vigorously and not peter out. If we at the plenum had limited ourselves only to stating deficiencies and difficulties and had not suggested specific directions for reorganization, such a plenum would have been of little benefit.

We must provide an answer to the main question that is uppermost in the minds of the people: How we are to make the reorganization irreversible and ensure that errors are not repeated? The Central Committee Politburo arrived at an unambiguous conclusion: The reogranization would get stuck if the main character -- the people -- did not join it thoroughly in all the spheres: the economic, social, political, spiritual and management spheres. Everything should be placed under the control of the people so as to make the reorganization irreversible and to prevent a repetition of what happened in the past. There is only one way to resolve these tasks, namely through broad democratization of Soviet society.

Prior to the January plenum everyone asked the question: Will this process not come to a stop? The January plenum strengthened the conviction within society that reorganization is assuming an irreversible character. This has greatly invigorated the attitudes of many sections of the population. There were quite a few people who stuck to a wait-and-see policy. Now they are joining the ranks of activists. However, this process is not easy, or without pain. What is the matter? Until now we were at the stage of developing a concept of social and economic development -- the April plenum, the 27th congress and the June plenum. As present, the process of reorganization has begun to move deeper into practice, and it has turned out that the process was affecting the interests of many: In one case -- through product acceptance by state-appointed inspectors, in a second -- through self-repayment and self-financing, in a third -- through election, in a fourth -- through control, openness, criticism and so on.

Nothing is surprising here. The process of reorganization affects ever newer spheres of societal life and the interests of all social groups. Typical of truly revolutionary changes, reorganization encourages and lends fresh vigour to some, others are perplexed, still others simply do not like the ongoing changes. These changes are particularly against the liking of those who had become used to working without much effort, to doing everything on the off-chance, and who are indifferent and inert. These changes also are not to the liking of the kind of person who, until now, ran the affairs of an enterprise, district, city or laboratory as if it were his own patrimony, with little regard for the opinion of the collective or the workforce. Among them also are people who used the atmosphere of total licence for embezzlement and gain, cynically disregarding our laws and morality. Here lie the sources of resistance to reorganization, sluggishness, and the desire to wait things out.

I repeat: In principle, this is no surprise. On the contrary, it would be strange if the reorganization suited all -- honest and dishonest, hard-working and lazy, activists, principled persons, and high-handed functionaries.

This would mean that something in our policy had not been well-considered, that something did not work, was faulty. There is here a political nuance that should not be disregarded. I mention selfish opponents of the reorganization. There is, however, dramatism in the situation when selfless, honest people who so far remain captives of outdated notions are among its opponents. These are people who have not realized the acuity and critical character of the problems facing society. We ought to persuade them and win their conficence through the correctness of our cause, through the success of the reorganization. It is our duty to help such people understand their true interests and find their place within the common ranks.

In general, the reorganization is affecting all: Politburo members, Central Committee secretaries, government members, workers, farmers, and intellectuals. It is affecting the whole of society, the interests of all and everyone. At this point I want to recall Lenin's instruction concerning the need to distinguish between short-term and vital interests of the working class. Yes indeed, the reorganization is affecting our short-time interests, but it meets the vital long-term interests of the working people. We ought to understand this; such an understanding is of principled significance. This is a very important provision. The reorganization ought to reveal socialism's potential, advance society to new frontiers, ensure a new quality of lie in all spheres -- economic, social, and intellectual -- and consolidate socialism. As I have already said, it meets the vital interests of the working people. If it is affecting us in some way today, we should consider everything calmly, objectively assess the situation, and adopt practical measures to abate outstanding problems.

We possess necessary politicial experience and theoretical potential to resolve the tasks facing society. One thing is clear: We should advance without fail along the path of reorganization. If the reorganization peters out, the consequences will be far more serious for society as a whole and for every Soviet person in particular. Our choice of the path is correct. We are not moving away from socialism. Through reorganization, we are developing the potential of the socialist system We are not moving away from democracy, but towards unfolding democracy in the working people's interests. So, shall we abandon all that? Shall we abandon reorganization to oblige those it affects and those who it compels to think, act and live in a new way? This would be no policy. This would be serving someone's interests and ambitions. The CPSU Central Committee and the government shall not agree to that; I want to assure of that -- you, your congress, and through you, the country's working people. We are convinced that this view is shared by the delegates to the trade unions congress and all Soviet people. This is what we take into account in our activity.

I will make one point anew. We must consistently and perseveringly broaden socialist democracy. The Soviet people have immense social and political experience. A great intellectual potential has been built up in the country. The generations in action today, which are taking reponsibility upon themselves, are generations that were born and have grown up under socialism. Socialism is a system of the working people. Everything taking place in the socialist state is a cause of the people. That is why we stand for criticism and self-criticism, which also should be the norm in life. We need such forceful forms of democracy as openness, criticism, and self-criticism to change every field of social life radically.

This is a guarantee against the repetition of past errors, and hence a guarantee that the reorganization process is irreversible.

Greater democratization might prompt some people to ask if we are not disorganizing society, if we shall not weaken management, and lower the standards for discipline, order, and responsibility.

This is an extremely important question, and we must have complete clarity on it, I will put it bluntly. Those who have doubts about the expediency of further democratization apparently suffer from one serious drawback that is of great political significance and meaning: They do not believe in our people. They claim that democracy will be used by our people to disorganize society and undermine discipline, to undermine the strength of the system. I think that we cannot agree to that.

Democracy is not the opposite of order. It is order of a great degree, not based on implicit obedience and mindless execution of instructions, but on full-fledged, active participation by all the community in all the affairs of society. Democracy is not the opposite of discipline. It is a conscious discipline and organization of working people based on a sense of really being master of the country, on collectivism, and solidarity of interests and efforts by all citizens. Democracy is not the antithesis of responsibility. It does not mean the absence of control of the existence of an everything-goes mentality.

Instead, democracy means self-control by society, confidence in the civic maturity and awareness of social duty in Soviet people. Democracy is the unity of rights and duties. The deepening of democracy certainly is no easy matter. There is no need to fear should everything not proceed smoothly at once of if the should be potholes and even gullies. Our society is mature, our party strong. The socialist system relies on the firmest foundation of the people's support and draws strength precisely from the democratism of our lifestyle. The more democracy we have, the faster we shall advance along the road of reorganization and social renewal, and the more order and discipline we shall have in our socialist home.

So! It is either democracy or social inertia and conservatism. There is no third way, comrades. I have already said recently that we need democracy not to show off or not to play at democracy. We need democracy to rearrange many things in our life, to give greater scope to peoples creativity and to new ideas and initiative.

Comrades, reorganization opens up new prospects and advances new taasks to be handled by the Soviet trade unions. What is the view of the priority tasks of trade unions in this connection? As far as I can see, precisely this question, central to your debate, was raised in Stepan Shalayev's report.

Let me express some opinions, too. These tasks and the ways of working toward them lie in two interconnected routes. One of them is the place of trade unions in society as a whole, their constitutional rights and obligations, their relationship with the party, with the state and its agencies, ministries, and departments, and with other public organizations. The other route is the activity of trade unions directly in the work collectives, their daily varied ties with the masses, with individuals.

The new conditions in which the country lives and acts, and the tasks, toward which we are working make us reevaluate also the role of trade unions in the life of society. I see the new role of trade unions in conditions of reorganization above all in their becoming a counterbalance to technocratic aspirations in economy that, one should say, have become widespread recently, and in pressing for the enhancement of the social trend of the economic decisions taken. This means that trade unions and participate vigorously in working out social sections of the plan and advance their own alternatives when necessary. More than that, trade unions must act vigorously on a nation-wide scale to prevent the gap in the solution of production tasks and development of the social sphere. This immense effort is required to rectify the situation.

This work must be joined actively, comrades. And if there are problems that need be solved legislatively, well, there are no obstacles to trade unions there either.

The proposals made by trade unions on this score invariably receive the most sincere attention and interested support of the party and state leadership. Well, I will say straightforwardly that we have an interest in the more active work of the trade unions.

Some trade union officials may have been offended or stung by my criticism -- you must remember while visiting in the Kuban area, I said that some trade union officials were dancing cheek to cheek with economic managers. I think you understood the message of that criticism: One has to have one's own firm stand and firmly pursue protecting the working people's interests.

I believe many useful and valuable things can be learned also by studying the work experience of trade unions in the fraternal socialist countries and of international trade union organisations.

The main thing here is the aims to which this work, its ultimate result, and its usefulness to people and society will be subordinate. The scope of trade union concerns is actually the life of people, with all its joys and concerns. This means that in solving vital questions of work, health, daily life, rest, and recreation of people, trade unions should act energetically, efficiently, and in a businesslike manner.

Take, for instance, one of the most burning of our problems -- housing. It is known that the party has set the important social task of in effect providing every family with an apartment or house for itself by the year 2000.

We are increasing efforts along all lines, involving both the state and the work collectives. In 1986 we built 5.2 million more square metres of housing than in 1985 and that increment is not the limit.

Housing complexes are being built for young people, and enterprise housing investment is being expanded. The state has decided to grant privileges to workers who want to build houses with their own money. It was stated at your congress, for instance, that home builders in the Far East have decided to increase by 50 per cent their ready construction parts without expanding production areas. Such an initiative can only be welcomed, and the builders in the Far East should be wished success in this initiative.

As you know, I visited the Far East last summer and saw with my own eyes the acuteness of the housing situation there. Housing is just as urgent an issue in other regions of the country; this came home once again during my visit to the Baltic region. The main problem is not so much a lack of money as the capacity of building organizations and the provision of housing construction with necessary material resources.

Local bodies should accomplish much here, and this already is being done in a number of republics, regions, towns, and districts. Housing is a national issue and it should be tackled accordingly.

All the work collectives should act as energetically as autoworkers in Gorkiy and Minsk, chemical workers in Voskresensk and steel workers in Kuybyshev. The trade unions jointly with economic management bodies should unfold this public initiative broadly throughout the country.

It is an immense reserve, comrades, and people understand that all the efforts of the country should be pooled to tackle this task as speedily as possible.

Putting the concrete individual in the focus of attention, the trade unions are called upon to take better care of their most valuable asset, human health, by promoting efficient health care and safety at work. Efforts to combat drunkenness must not be slackened either. This fight has brought about substantial positive change, primarily in regards to public health and order in our society. But there still are many problems. For the time being, losses of worktime through temporary disability are "conscientiously" put on record from one year to the next and in industry alone have been more than 10 times those caused by absenteeism, idle time, and absences with official permission.

Important decisions have now been prepared on these matters. The trade unions should make a contribution to this matter of importance to the state. A complex of resolutions have been drawn up on further improvements in health care in the country.

One more point: We have already talked a good deal about formalism in socialist competition, but there is almost no change. Yet today we need emulation first of all to develop worker creativity, initiative, competitiveness of mind and talent, the art of organization and the mastering of front-ranking experience.

It is time to actually do something we have been talking about for years -- reorienting the system of socialist emulation to indices of quality, resource saving, and strict fulfillment of contracts. These are the three whales, so to speak, on which socialist competition should be based first and foremost. It is precisely that area in which the trade unions' priority role is beyond doubt. Special instructions to this effect should not be delayed. Every precondition has been provided. Now tackle these matters and you will bear the most responsibility for them.

Since this is so, I must say the trade unions have grown accustomed to an absence of genuine competitiveness, to eyewash, to abundant forms of emulation which are so confused that a normal person simply fails to understand what this is all about. At times one even begins to think some "paper motor" has been put into the sphere of emulation with the help of trade unions and revolves regardless of whether anybody is emulating drive or not.

It is time to bring socialist emulation back down to earth, to the production shops and teams, to subordinate it to real pressing tasks, to make it a matter of the working people themselves who are interested in mastering the best experience, in perfecting their work and themselves. In short, comrades, you have more than enough concerns. In conditions of consistent democratization of society, the role of trade unions will steadily rise, as will their responsibility for the economic and social policies. Their cultural and educational targets will become more complex and diverse.

Continuing the theme of what the role of trade unions should be in the present conditions, I would like to say the following. The fate of the restructuring is being decided not in offices but by the actual deeds of work collectives. The work collective is the central cell in the restructuring effort and everything in the long run depends on attitudes in this cell, on the new way work develops. In effect this is a problem of a person's real position in his collective and thereby in our society as a whole.

How is his work organized? How productive is it and how is it remunerated? In what measure are a person's performance at work and satisfaction of his need interconnected? How are the relations between allied trades, between accessory manufacturers, between officials and subordinates at all levels built?

Here the dependence is simple and clear: As things go in the work collectives, so shall they go in the whole of society. If we manage to organize highly productive work and ensure a high quality of output, then the country's economy as a whole will advance. If there is order and organization in the collectives, there will be order and organization everywhere in society. If we learn all together to build normal human relations in the collective and if we make the moral and psychological climate healthier, the entire social atmosphere in the country will be just as healthy.

The party's Central Committee attaches much importance to the law on the state enterprise (amalgamation). A draft has been submitted to nationwide discussion. In effect, the draft law is invested with a new ideology for economic management. We do not think that it is truth in the last instance or that it is a finalized document. If we approached it in this way there would be no need to put it to a countrywide discussion. We think this document provides a good basis for a broad discussion in our society, for a thorough analysis of all the views and remarks and for the writing of a good law on the state enterprise.

The law is called upon to change cardinally the conditions and methods of economic activity in the main link of the economy, and to reinforce by legislation the combination of the planning principle and full financial autonomy.

I will name such measures of a fundamental nature as the creation of the first twenty inter-branch scientific-technical complexes, the introduction of new principles for increasing remuneration of work in the productive branches, the introduction of state quality control of output at 1,500 leading enterprises, second and third shifts in a number of production collectives, the extensive development of cooperative forms in the spheres of production and services, and the spread of the system of collective and family contracts. And this list could be continued.

As you see, the reforms are proceeding extensively and steadily. Yet the work in a new way is actually only beginning.

If we take the production life of a work collective I believe the most important changes there will be determined by the transformation of the economic mechanism that has been started, by the transition to cost-accounting, self-financing, self-repayment and self-management. But these measures, comrades, will really begin to work only when each work collective will take them as something that is their own, as close and vital to them and not something from above.

Generally speaking, who needs cost-accounting and who stands to gain from it? Those who work honestly. It is needed by the country and in the final analysis by every working family, by every working man and woman.

To whom does cost-accounting pose a danger? To the windbag because it immediately exposes his untenability. To the idler and shoddy worker because it hits out at the very mainstays of their parasitical well-being achieved at the expense of society and of all honest working people. We all must approach in a new way the role of the work collective both in society, in the economic sphere, and in the life of every Soviet citizen.

Who besides the work collective can really discern the social countenance of every person, determine the measure of social justice not in general and on the whole but, so to say, on a roll-call basis? Who knows best where possibilities have been exhausted and where considerable reserves remain untapped?

Who has done everything and where, and where has work in a slipshod manner become a norm? Finally, where can a man exercise his rights and fulfill his obligations of really being in charge if not in his own collective, right in his workplace?

It appears the experience of recent times has demonstrated with the utmost clarity -- one's renunciation of an active stance in life costs dearly both society as a whole and every person. And let me tell you straight, we will not be able to change that situation until everyone has a personal need and personal responsibility for it -- until he feels that he is in charge.

Comrades, I would like to emphasize specially the following aspect. In the current "cost accounting" situation the work collectives and trade unions are becoming a strong partner of the state in furthering social programs.

I should think that the AUCCTU and the republican trade union councils could make a broader use of the right of legislative initiative in the interests of the working people and, when and where necessary, oppose more forcefully attempts by economic bodies to infringe on the prerogatives of the work collectives.

It is wrong when production plans are changed without the consent of the trade unions, when money is taken from the economic incentive funds and when other violations are tolerated. The trade unions must not put up with such a situation. And we shall support them. Evidently attention should be devoted to the AUCCTU's proposal on giving the trade unions the right to suspend any decisions taken without their knowledge where such decisions affect terms of payment for work, and the work-rest relationship, and to be actively involved in shaping policy for pricing diverse goods and services.

They should have the possibility to act as resolutely where social welfare establishments and environmental protection facilities are omitted at enterprises under construction.

Speaking about that one must not neglect the following phenomenon -- many trade unions as yet remain in the second echelon of the reorganization, as it were, and that holds for such a vital mater as protection of the interests of the working people and upholding social justice. Take the matter of pay. We have started a serious reorganization in that sphere. And it should be said the matter at hand is not a campaign or some once-only undertaking, but a principled policy line toward eliminating levelling.

This is a serious political matter, comrades. Work and work alone should be the criterion for determining man's value, his social prestige and his material status.

It should be noted that in the conditions of cost accounting, self-financing and self-profitability the sources of payment for work and the provision of financial incentives depend on the profit of an enterprise, on the funds earned, and the work collective in essence takes charge in distributing them.

But let us ponder the following matter: Are trade unions doing everything they can to actively influence the policy of payment for work? You know better than I, certain enterprises are still in no hurry to part with wage levelling. The management is in no hurry because it is a bothersome matter that requires changes in the organization of production and calls for good order in work quota setting; and a trade union committee, too, often wants to go on living without treating anyone badly.

No, comrades, it is high time we did away with this kind of "timidity". Some will have to be treated badly: the slacker, the drunkard and the slovenly. Let them take no offense: They are getting what they deserve.

And we will elevate -- both materially and morally -- the diligent man, the one who is working tooth and nail. The trade unions should defend his interests might and [word indistinct]. I must say that the trade unions have not as yet joined in earnest in the important undertaking of getting two- and three-shift rotas. This is a badly needed and economically important matter -- in our industry alone fixed production assets worth R100 billion are not loaded properly and in essence are idling. The trouble is, however, that at many enterprises the introduction of work in many shifts often has been approached in a bureaucratic fashion, without due regard for production organization, catering, public transport, or many other vitally important problems.

I had many meetings in Latvia and Estonia, and among the issues raised the problem of getting two- and three-shift rotas was one of the main problems taken up everywhere. In Yurmala, where working people from practically all over the country -- from Sakhalin to the western regions -- are vacationing, those questions were also put before me. What did the people say? There are enterprises where one shift is divided into two just to fulfill an order either from the respective branch ministry or from local authorities: Fifty percent work during the first shift and 50 percent during the second. So, it turns out that during the first shift, 50 percent of the equipment is used and the other 50 percent is used during the second. This is a mockery both of common sense and of an undertaking of state significance. For the Leningraders' plan, approved by the Politburo, was to concentrate two or three shifts on the advanced, progressive equipment so as to receive a maximum return from it, to improve labor productivity and at the same time to accomplish the planned tasks, to remove the old equipment and open up the road for speeding up the modernization. At the same time this enables an enterprise to do without expansion, without building new premises, to release funds and channel them into building housing, and social and cultural establishments. Such is the major plan of state significance contained in that idea. Instead, some managers just go through the motions and profane that very important undertaking.

Trade unions should pay special attention to this. If one enterprise changes, it is unlikely that the entire city will alter its normal rhythm in the area of transport, organization of trade, education and work of pre-school centres, and consumer services. Therefore, the transition should be carried out by the city or basically by the entire city. This seems so clear that no discussion is required. Nevertheless transition to two- and three-shift rotas often is carried out without the restructuring of city services' operations which I have just mentioned. This is a mistake; This is done in unnecessary haste that discredits the important state undertaking. We said this recently in a resolution of the Central Committee and the government. We made a first analysis of the work in this direction and defined a number of major measures of which you already know. Anyway, we decided to provide incentives for those working on second and especially third shifts. This, I think, is correct. We ought to do that. This is an extremely important state task that is to be resolved.

I think that in the conditions of growing economic independence, work collectives will demand from trade union activists that they be more principled and energetic in using the rights enjoyed by the trade unions. You have these rights. The Soviet trade unions possess great and material force. These are the right to monitor how the administration fulfills its agreements and contracts and the right to criticize economic managers for actions contradicting the legitimate interests of the working people. Naturally, in putting higher demands on trade union functionaries, it is necessary to display maximum attention and tact and to extend support for them. Trade union committees should become genuine, I would say, rather than convenient, in many ways, partners of the administration and should consistently defend workers' interests. To be frank, substandard working conditions at many enterprises, insufficient health care and inadequate rest rooms are something that trade union organizations have become used to in many places. This still occurs very often. The legitimate rights and interests of working people imply using boldly the trade unions' great potentialities and acting, as necessary, to have wrong decisions corrected.

In closing my remarks on domestic affairs, I want to remind you of V.I. Lenin's words: "We must see to it that literally every member of the trade unions stands to gain from production, and remembers that only by increasing production and raising labor productivity will Soviet Russia be in a state to win." This is the way V.I. Lenin put the question in 1920; this is the way we put it today in the conditions of new revolutionary changes. A time has come when unprecedented opportunities are opening up for better work, for greater results and for vigorous endeavours to build a better future with due account for all our rich experience and with all our considerable potentialities being tapped. Let us act, comrades, in this direction.

Now to international affairs, since enough has been said lately on this account, I hope. Such issues are directly linked to the course of our domestic development. These affairs take much effort while the world situation, as you are aware, has remained complex over the past years. What is most essential is that imperialism and reactionary forces are doing their utmost to hinder, come what may, our onward development and to compel us to remain on the tracks of military confrontation.

The 27th congress emphasized that the party saw its principal internationalist duty in leading the country successfully on along the trail blazed by the October Revolution. Such is the strict criterion by which we ought to measure each step; such is the viewpoint from which we should assess the tasks that are being advanced and the choice of policy, both inside the country and in the international arena.

The words reorganization [perestroika] and openness [glasnost] are viewed everywhere abroad, especially since the January meeting of the Central Committee, as synonymous with progress and peace. Naturally, some -- our allies, friends, and democratically minded people -- are following with hope, confidence, and great expectations the changes in our society, the style and atmosphere of our everyday life. Others -- political and ideological opponents -- are watching these processes not without certain apprehensions and at times even hostility.

Characteristically, despite these differences, the main thing has been correctly noticed abroad: The new way of thinking that the party has set out as the basis of its policy is the CPSU's response to the challenge of the time, a challenge calling for a fundamentally new apporach to the tasks that have come before mankind at the end of the second millennium. There are, in fact, two fundamental tasks, that of saving the world from nuclear catastrophe and that of placing at man's service in immense potential of knowledge, and material and spiritual possibilities he possesses.

They are, indeed, immense, urgent, and closely interrelated. The party, in working out its strategy for acceleration and reorganization, has set an example by approaching them from humanist Marxist-Leninist positions.

The Soviet proposals aimed at eliminating weapons of mass destruction and establishing a comprehensive security system have evoked a special response. Some of them are already working -- they have become the subject of dialogues and negotiations, both bilateral and multilateral. Properly speaking, we have tried to give an impetus to the reorganization of interstate relations as well as to bring them into alignment with the real tasks and requirements of our times. As a result, international life has become more dynamic, and the tendencies toward the search for forms and means of deepening political, economic, scientific, technical, and cultural cooperation have grown stronger.

True, sometimes we can hear such an opinion: All this is correct, we do support the party's foreign policy, but the world is still an intranquil place: The arms race goes on and on, the nuclear threat remains a reality, and American imperialism is not only unwilling to disarm, but is also building up its offensive capability. Such an assessment of the situation is, on the whole, correct, but I believe it is still incomplete. Yes, the situation on the international scene is dangerous; the Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear arms limitation are making no headway through the fault of the U.S. rulers and acute conflicts in various regions of this planet are fraught with grave complicatons.

One should not disregard another aspect either. A dramatic change in the very atmosphere of international relations, in public sentiment, in the attitude of both ordinary people and many statesmen on the principal question of today -- the question of war or peace -- has made itself felt and is becoming every more pronounced.

This has been manifestly confirmed by the Moscow forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, For the Survival of Humanity." It was a very representative meeting of authoritative scientists, writers, artists, musicians, businessmen, public, and religious figures from very many countries, a meeting of people who are mostly far from a socialist world outlook and even people who hold conservative views on major political and social issues. It is also a fact, and quite meaningful.

However, the people were brought together by one conviction: Only affirmation of a new mode of thinking in international relations can prevent nuclear war, can make peace not only possible but inevitable.

The forum has been an important event in international life, and I would say a barometer of the sentiment of world public opinion. And the needle of that barometer is pointing firmly and plainly to peace.

There have been debates, heated ones too, as to how to proceed in that direction, how to resolve certain problems and substantial differences in approach that have cropped up. Well, debates, criticism, and comparison of views are all quite natural and the surest road to truth. And the truth, the need to avert a catastrophe, to survive and to learn how to live in a manner befitting human beings, has never, as far as I know, been called into question by any of the participants in the Moscow meeting.

It seems to me that the forum's results demonstrate that a new, very broad, heterogeneous, and yet momentous movement -- the movement for the survival of humanity -- is taking shape in the world. This is a favorable sign. It gives rise to confidence in the victory of reason over the forces of war and militarism.

Trade union organizations in different countries are becoming ever more active in combatting the nuclear threat. The trade union movement is a major force in the contemporary world and one of the most important components of the movement for humanity's survival.

The coupling of the fight for the workig people's interests with the fight for peace and disarmament means that the masses' awareness of the danger looming over humankind is ever more clear and profound. This is why it is so important that the trade unions join in that fight.

I am glad for the chance to greet at your congresss numerous envoys and representatives of trade unions from different countries, of their international associations.

I am convinced that the right to live and work in peace is a primary and inalienable right of every person. Nothing can set working people against themselves. The arms race and war bring workers neither profits nor dividents. Peace, cooperation, and work provide the conditions for worker well-being and social progress.

The peace and security of a country is not the concern of diplomats and politicians alone. Peace and security for the homeland is the concern of every one of us, of all Soviet people. Comrades, I would like to make a point. Peace is to be achieved primarily by our everyday work at the factory, in the field, and at the research institute. The better and more succussfully we cope with our tasks at home, the louder and more forcefully will resound the voice of the Soviet Union in defense of peace internationally.

Comrades, today we know and understand full well that the all-out offensive -- economic, political, psychological and militarist -- launched by the forces of reaction at the end of the 70s and the beginning of the 80s was dictated, among other things, by our internal state of affairs.

Today, with the enemy's stake on our lagging behind having suffered a serious setback, imperialism is shifting the emphasis to preventing us from enacting the plans for reform by hampering , slowing down and frustrating them through the arms race. To this end they exert every effort to maintain international tension and preserve conditions in the world which continue to describe the USSR as a source of all evils and misforutnes. All this is as outdated as imperialism itself. There is nothing unexpected or principally new in such behaviour by the reactionaries.

Our answer is clear. We have been and will keep doing everything necessary to absolutely guarantee our security and the security of our friends and allies, so that no one is tempted to test our borders. But we shall not make a single step in excess of the demands and requirements of sensible, sufficient defense. Let us not repeat -- automatically without thinking -- what imperialism is seeking to impose on us in the arms race. We are keeping and will continue to keep all doors open for any honest steps to limit and reduce arms, to secure dependable verification over this process, and to strengthen international mutual security.

Our every step along the path of socialist renewal is both a victory for the forces of peace and progress and a setback for the forces of aggression and militarism.

This is, comrades, how the issues we are advancing in domestic policy merge with the matters to be resolved in the international arena. The tasks of acceleration, reorganization of socialist society, prevention of nuclear catastrophe, demilitarization of the world and humanization of international relations form the core of the strategic course of the 27th CPSU Congress, a course confirmed and particularized by the January plenum of the Central Committee. Let me assure you, comrades, that the party shall not depart from the course it has taken. Relying on your support, on the support of the workers, farmers and intellectuals, all Soviet people, the party shall advance -- resolutely, boldly and purposefully -- along the path started 70 years ago by the Great October Socialist Revolution.

I wish the congress successful work, and the delegates and guests big new accomplishments, health and vigour.

FEARED DISTURBANCES CANCEL ART SHOW ACTIVITIES

WA251200 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 4, 1-8 Feb 87 p 11

[Article by Vasiliy Andreyev: "The Negative Aspect of Popularity" under the rubric "Postscript"]

[Text] "If you don't understand or like something, if you find it alien, the most helpless and irreparable thing to do is to..."

Let me interrupt the quote here in order to say that I am quoting one of the contributions to the final discussion of the 17th exhibition of work by young Moscow artists, which was covered for MN by Aleksander Kamenskiy (see No. 49, 1986), and also in order to explain the reason for writing again about this event, now six weeks old.

The formal pretext is quite simple: there have been rumours that the exhibition was closed before time, banned, or even broken up altogether. To be quite clear on the point, we waited for the summing up of its results, which had been repeatedly postponed. At long last, the conference took place on January 4, 1987. Now we can say that the rumours were not confirmed.

The cultural programme of final five days of the exhibition was banned, as well as the visitors' conference and the work of the "Laboratory" which exhibited and discussed the works not included in the main exhibition. Nor were "people from the street" admitted to the closing "ceremony". As for the rest, no rules were broken: the exhibition was on for the planned 18 days.

Of course, we might argue that this event which proved so interesting could have been extended. What motives -- economic, tactical or moral -- prevailed in deciding against it? 4,000 visitors a day is no trifling matter.

Well, plans must be fulfilled: the exhibition was to last 18 days, not a day longer. All right, we shall not dispute the plan. On the contrary, let's defend it, and say that all events included in it ought to have been held, even those envisaged by the cultural programme.

The cultural events began every night at eight, an hour after the exhibition was closed. An hour was needed to clear the rooms of the paying visitors (which was not always easy to do) and to admit those not paying. On the night of December 10, the non-paying guests came in the hundreds, because the avantgarde fashion show had been announced. Perhaps, the crowd appeared too large for the organizers' liking, so the doors did not open to them on that night.

It should be noted that popularity was the main drawback of the 17th exhibition. It is considered to be the surest sign of "a cheap sensation". It should be added, though, that the exhibition was visited by a record number of experts (15,000 as compared with 6,000 that visited the 45-day Ilya Glazunov's exhibition).

The majority of the visitors, however, were young and "uninformed". This seemed rather disquieting to the administration. The organizing committee, on the contrary, were naive enough to regard the introduction of the "uninformed" to art as their main achievement. In this way, the organizers sought to help the agencies under whose auspices the exhibition was held, namely the Commission for the Propaganda of Soviet Art, the USSR Artists' Union, the Moscow branches of the same union, and the city Committee of the Young Communist League. Apparently, they did not appreciate the excessive popularity.

On December 11, a jazz evening was cancelled, on December 12 -- the discussion of modern European art. December 13 proved an unlucky date for the TV crew who came to film the visitors' conference for the "World and Youth" programme, but only shot the artists and critics infuriated by yet another ban.

The cultural programme ended with two cancelled theatrical do's. After much reticence and numerous circumlocutions, Tamara Bedoyeva, Director of the exhibition hall, made her position public: "It's the wrong sort of youth that comes here. Not our youth." A serious argument, no doubt Let's discuss it seriously.

Indeed, the young people who came to the exhibition were not of the sort depicted on festive posters. We have neglected that sort long enough to have lost touch with them altogether. At the same time, we have found names for their music -- "deafening", for their clothes -- "gaudy", for their hairdos -- "provoking", and for their interests -- "narrow". Thus they became "the wrong sort", and the contact was lost.

Then suddenly, it was there again. Unusual guests came to the exhibition from darkened lobbies, bars and public gardens -- attracted by what? By the pungent taste of informality resulting from the exhibition organizers' desire (realized only partially) to present not the best of whatever there was, but what there was. The removal of various bans showed the real worth of everything. Unrecognized geniuses cannot exist in the glaring light of openness. They either become recognized or are proved to be no geniuses at all. False idols lose their attraction, and true values come to light, provided the contact is built upon by both sides.

Isn't it strange that the moment we grant young people freedom we start fearing they might use it. Instead of waiting for the results of the "liberalizing actions", we set about preventing their "undesirable effects". I am sorry to admit, we are not yet ready for this kind of contact.

The organizing committee had no problem understanding the visitors, the problems were with the administration. It is well known that one needs arguments for discussion, but a pretext is enough for a ban.

"It's the wrong sort of youth" was a good enough pretext.

A very symbolic thing happened during the performance of the amateur rock groups, Aquarium and Sounds of Mu, one night. The music took the administration by surprise. I must admit that the sight of a dancing crowd at an art exhibition might seem disconcerting. Two administrators, in consultation with a representative of the city Komsomol, decided that a black-out in the exhibition hall might put an end to the dancing party. There is no telling what the young crowd, exhilarated by music, could have done to the premises in the dark. Most certainly, this exhibition of youth art would have proved a dead end in the evolution of Soviet art exhibitions. Fortunately, by a sheer miracle, the evening drew to a peaceful end, with the lights on.

What was that? Yet another administrative lapse? Haven't we had enough already? Remember the concerts by the British reggae group, UB 40 ("Everybody meant well", MN No. 44, 1986), the last day at the Manege exhibition ("The Manege, a crossroads of opinions", MN No. 47, 1986), of our coverage of the art fair in Bitza. These were all edifying stories about the right hand being scared about what the left hand was doing. It is high time we understood that the risk is not necessariy unjustified, the experiment unsuccessful, and the initiative punishable. It is high time we came to understand that every good project should be carried through, or else it is no good launching it. It is high time we realized that playing the game of democracy means playing against your own team.

HEALTH MINISTRY OFFICIAL ON DRUG ABUSE STATISTICS

AU240910 Vienna DIE PRESSE in German 20 Feb 87 p 10

["F.H." report: "Drug Problem in USSR Exacerbating"]

[Text] Vienna -- The USSR, which in the past attributed the drug problem with disgust to the Western economic system now, so to speak is little by little admitting that it has problems of its own with drug addicts. Speaking in Vienna yesterday Edvard A. Babayan, head of the drug department of the Soviet Ministry of Health, said there are 46,000 registered drug addicts. Previously, 4,000 new addicts were registered annually, but in 1985 this figure rose to 9 000.

Opiates are the most popular drugs among the Soviets. There is no organized trade, Babayan noted, but he reported burglaries in hospitals and pharmaceutical firms. People who were caught were even asked why they were taking drugs. "But none mentioned unemployment or the socialist system as a reason," Babayan stated.

BRIEFS

PRESIDIUM RED BANNER AWARD -- By decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, for services to the Communist Party and the Soviet state, and in connection with his 50th birthday, Yegor Semenovich Stroyev, first secretary of the Orel Obkom, has been awarded the Red Banner of Labor. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 24 Feb 87 LD]

FORUM DEBATES ELECTION OF ECONOMIC CADRES

PM261401 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 17 Feb 87 p 2

[Undated report by "our special correspondents" L. Telen and L. Tsvetkov: "Who to Elect and How? This question was examined by participants in a business meeting at the USSR Council of Ministers Academy of National Economy"; passages between slantlines published in boldface]

[Text] The election of economic leaders before our eyes has ceased to be a sensation and become a norm of life, the legal basis of cadres policy in production. The draft law on the state enterprise is specific "The appointment of leaders by election is implemented at the enterprise, ensuring an improvement in the qualitative makeup of leading cadres and the enhancement of their responsibility for the results of their activity." The open discussion of candidates, voting, competition among several contenders -- all this seemed absolutely clear to us journalists. But it emerged that the participants in the business meeting were unable to agree with us. The provisions of the draft gave rise to questions and doubts among them.

Indeed, in theory everything had indeed already been checked Appointment by election logically stems from the fundamental restructuring of the principles of economic management. This approach fully accords with the spirit of the CPSU Central Committee January Plenum. The intensification of financial autonomy and the enhancement of the role of economic levers, financing itself and paying its own way, restructuring wages and introducing state acceptance -- all this makes the labor collective's prosperity directly dependent on the abilities of the organizers who head it. And since that is the case working people should have real opportunities for selecting the best organizers and monitoring their activity. But here there are questions which still remain open. How exactly to organize the election procedure? Who to choose from? How to use legislation to protect production from economic leaders who are incompetent, even if they have been approved by the collective?

The opinions of the participants in this meeting are, of course, not indisputable. But can we expect cool dispassionateness from directors and their deputies and ministry employees whose interests are the first to be affected by democratic innovation? We invite our readers to take part in this conversation too. Do you agree with the opinions of those taking part in the meeting? What viewpoint do you adhere to? In brief, the conversation is beginning.

A Campaign? No, a Strategy! [subhead]

A situation for discussion. In democratizing management, Bulgarian economic leaders announced general election for leaders in production as a national campaign In the course of the first 2 months of the campaign the country elected foremen and team leaders, then shop chiefs, and finally association and enterprise directors. In just 6 months the complete democratic renewal of leading cadres was accomplished. Is Bulgaria's experience completely suited to our own economy? Is it realistic to reelect simultaneously all production commanders everywhere -- to promote, discuss, and test them through public opinion? This was the question which /Doctor of Juridical Sciences Yu. Tikhomirov, chief of the department of law and the psychology of management/, used, apparently deliberately, to bring the conversation immediately to a head.

"Absurd!" /A. Botov, director of the Karaganda heating equipment plant/, stated categorically. [paragraph continues]

"Just imagine: Tomorrow election fever will encompass all enterprises great and small. But who will work and implement the ideas of economic restructuring?"

Fuss and haste in cadre policy, participants in the businesslike meeting said in Botov's support, will inevitably result in premature economic decisions, short-sighted actions, and even actual economic blunders. Do we need democracy at this price?

"Self-management should accelerate restructuring, not delay it. Let's proceed from that premise," /L. Kubarev, deputy chief and chief engineer at the Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry's "Soyuztransformator" All-Union Production Association/, summed up.

There is no doubt this is the most correct point of departure. "On the basis of self-management," the draft law on the state enterprise emphasizes, "the pooling of the working people's efforts and the development of their initiative is ensured to achieve good work results." But how to manage without losses or at least minimize these losses while gaining an understanding of the science of democracy?

Above all we must check the actual procedure for elections, and many of those taking part in the meeting drew attention to this. Everyone was agreed that election was necessary but no one knew exactly how to do it. And these questions cannot be resolved on paper, all hope rests with practice.

"But surely the labor collectives must be prepared for self-management? /B. Bychikhin, chief of the All-Union "Soyuzplodopitomnik" Association/, joined in the talk. "It is one thing when the director is elected by a healthy and strong collective but quite another when he is elected by a collective selected almost randomly..."

Reasonable? Perhaps even the collective may display incorrectness -- it may make a mistake or even deliberately defend a deliberately wrong decision which is of benefit to itself but harmful to society. And not every collective has leaders of the kind who even now are on the board of honor. Occasionally an instance comes to light of a demagogue or even worse a self-seeker or dodger winning the workers' trust... But we shall not forget that you cannot gain experience from other people's blunders. Least of all social experience. The discussion of cadres in the presence of the people, open elections, openness -- this comprises the practice which will really give the working person access to self-management, will become a school of civicism for him, and help him pass the test of political maturity. Participation in the elections of rank and file personnel and only later a gradual transition to the election of major leaders -- that is the path which some of those taking part in the businesslike meeting defended.

"Why pen a living cause within such a far-fetched scheme?" A. Botov objected. "Please tell me the point in hastily relecting sensible and skillful leaders who have contact with people and are up to date with regard to production. Let's begin with those who are obviously helpless, who must be replaced not for the sake of an idea but primarily in the interests of the matter."

But here is another doubt:

"But what if the replacement of a leader is essential but there is no worthy contender, one that the collective would approve?" Yu. Tikhomirov again proposes a real situation for the audience's attention. [paragraph continues]

"For instance, at the second watch factory we are unable to find contenders for foreman vacancies..."

Again a dispute arose. What should the line of conduct be then? Persuade "your own men" or call in outsiders? How is all this reconciled with the actual election procedure? Gradually a solution emerges: /In disputed cases sanction a provincial appointment to a post with a probationary period./ This provision must be enshrined n the law.

The position was thus clarified. It was formulated as follows. /It is necessary to transfer to the election of leaders gradually and consistently, introducing election at different stages of management. Above all where the replacement of leaders is required by the interests of the matter./

When the Plant is a Giant

Situation for disussion. A small sewn goods factory elects a director at a meeting of the entire collective. Present at the meeting are about 200 workers and a candidate for the post drawn from "their own ranks." They are familiar with all his merits and weaknesses. But a director is needed for a giant like the "Avtovaz" for instance. Is it expedient to hold elections here too?

The procedure for electing the leader of a large and superlarge enterprise generated particular interest among the academy audience. What variations were proposed?

The first variation proposed was the gradational one, with workers nominating team leaders, team leaders nominating foremen from their midst and foremen nominating shift chiefs and so on right up to the director, elected by the shop chiefs. This proposal was put by /M. Struk, leader of the Bryansk Irrigation Machinery Plant./

Retort from the auditorium:

"But the directors' council could elect ministry leaders."

This option has the attraction that each level of electors has the necessary competence to assess the electee correctly. But a scheme for nomination "from top to bottom" was also immediately proposed. A. Botov cited the following arguments:

"I was promoted to director from the workers' ranks. That does not mean that every subordinate knows me sufficiently well as a leader. From this viewpoint I am better known to the ministry. Let the collegium submit candidates for the post of director.

Question from the auditorium:

"How will that differ from conventional appointment?"

/G. Paskar, chief of the Moldavian SSR Ministry of Procurements Elevator Industry Administration/, came to Botov's assistance:

"There must be at least two candidates: from the ministry and from the collective."

"I agree that the sector headquarters and the ministry must not be isolated from cadre policy," /V. Burnashev, Kazakh SSR deputy minister of the construction materials industry/, said in his support.

However, even the nomination of a countercandidacy will not resolve this question: It is still the collective which elects the leader. There are no guarantees that the collective will elect a far-sighted and mature economic leader who refuses to be easygoing and who looks into the future and who for the sake of this future refuses to promise immediate benefits. What should be done?

/V. Markovich, section chief of the Ministry of the Aviation Industry's production administration/, proposed the following way out:

"At the election a representative of the ministry collegium should be allocated a substantial proportion of votes -- 25-30 percent of the total. The remainder belongs to the collective."

"In my opinion the ministry collegium should hold the actual competition for the post of leader for supergiants," was the opinion of Yu. Tikhomirov.

Some of the participants in the businesslike meeting supported B. Bychikhin's idea for introducing an amendment to the draft law: electing not all but only the first leaders of the enterprise:

"The right to decide other cadre questions at the plant should be given to a director chosen and appointed by the ministry."

The clause in the draft law to the effect that the enterprise leader is elected for 5 years gave rise to many arguments. For instance, G. Paskar believes that the term could be limited to 3 years with an annual review of the economic leader's activity. If the reviews are positive, then, without any reelections involving the need to swallow yet more tranquillizers, the director automatically assumes another 3-year term. If the review is poor, then you do not have to wait a whole 5 years for a replacement.

/V. Stephaneko, chief engineer and first deputy general director of one of the science and production associations of the Ministry of Construction, Road, and Municipal Machine Building/, believes that /in general one may appoint directors for weak enterprises./ And to keep in mind reelections every 5 years only as a means of protecting the collective from lack of talent, if it is manifested during this period.

Do Delegate... But Check [subhead]

Situation for discussion. A director was elected at the Ministry of Railways "Manet" plant. They discussed and argued and in the end decided the plant should be headed by a man with not higher education, as the qualification requirements dictated, but secondary technical education. "Comment on this fact," Doctor of Juridical Sciences /Professor A. Vengerov/ asked the participants in the meeting.

"They were the ones who elected him, they are the ones who will have trouble," A. Botov assessed the situation as categorically as ever. "Surely a director with college or even technical college education will not be able to handle [vytyanet] an enterprise. Qualification requirements are drawn up precisely to be compulsory for all."

The next subject emerged: Who to choose from. "The leader of an enterprise or structural unit of an association is elected by a general meeting (conference)," the draft points out. This provision needs to be deciphered, Yu. Tikhomirov said, expressing the common viewpoint.

And one more subject taken from life. The widely publicized elections at the "RAF" [expansion unknown] were striking in their flamboyant progress. "We invite anyone who wants to take part in the competition," was the announcement made via a youth newspaper. What happened? Some 4,000 applications flew in to Yelgava from all parts of the country. From milkmaids, schoolgirls, teachers, drivers, and hundreds and hunreds of trusting simpletons, naively believing they had a chance. Here is the question: Was it worth misleading thousands of people when it was as clear as twice two is two to the organizers of the competition that neither a driver nor a student would become the "RAF" director. There is hardly any point in repeating this graphic but highly unprofessional experiment, was how Yu. Tikhomirov assessed the "RAF" elections.

But where then to take candidates from? The participants in the meeting rapidly pinpointed several ways. The collective itself nominates contenders. The party committee expresses its opinion. The ministry nominates its own candidate who takes part in the elections on an equal footing with candidates from the enterprise's "own men." Finally, the labor collective council announces an open contest to fill empty posts.

"What happens, do I nominate whomever I like?" M. Struk said with a shrug. "What about the reserve? We are working painstakingly with these people, training and nurturing them. Now it turns out that the reserve must be completely eliminated? I propose nominating contenders only from the reserve.

What if there are outside candidates? No, the objection came, such a regulation would be of no benefit.

"Commissions of experts should engage in the preliminary selection of contenders," Candidate of Juridical Sciences /N. Barabasheva/ suggested. "Let them decide initially whether a contender's personal qualities meet the qualifications requirements or not and only then admit him to the competition tests."

But, the reader will say, here you are, having had no time to speak of democratic restructuring in management, already calculating how to restrict the freedom which has been granted. Will we not reduce to nothing and distort the very idea of nomination through election?

No, what we need are not stimulating shows but quintessential democracy. Firmly established criteria do not rule out freedom of choice but really guarantee its expediency. That was the conclusion reached by the participants in the businesslike meeting and they put their propoals. /The role of qualifications requirements should be clearly outlined in legislation and elaborated in detail in special provisions on elections for everyone -- from foreman to director./

And so the contender is admitted to the contest and the voters expect a program of action from him.

"Exactly what program," Yu. Tikhomirov sought to specify, and immediately suggested formulating its general principles compulsory for all.

/Let the program -- the audience suggested enshrining this provision in the law as well -- explain the strategy of the future leader: his production, scientific-technical, managerial, and social strategy,/ That is not an empty formality. In setting out his concept and working out its elements in detail, the contender can once again weight up his strength and relate them to real difficulties.

In brief, the aim of the law and normative acts which will follow it are not only to preserve the purity and inviolability of democratic principles; they must also protect production from fortuitous cadre decisions. Society requires reliable guarantees that democracy will serve to benefit the economy, not to harm it.

New Captain -- New Crew? [subhead]

Situation for discussion. The term of office of a director is coming to an end and the collective is electing a new director. What happens about the deputies, chief specialists, and section leaders whom the former director of course tried to pick "to suit himself?" Even if they were elected to their posts? And what happens to the director himself is also of some importance -- is he adequately protected?

About the "crew." Since the director appointed the deputies and chief specialists, his "retirement" should not affect their fate: It is their legal right to continue working at their posts. That is how the audience assessed the situation.

Professor A. Vengerov believes that appointment by election established by legislation cannot form a normal part of production life unless a whole series of legal questions are eliminated. For instance, the draft law states that the collective elects its leader but a higher-ranking managerial organ confirms him. But if it does not confirm him -- what then? Who has the right to resolve the dispute ultimately? In the present edition of the draft the collective's voice is essentially merely a consultative one.

Or another variation. The audience drew attention to it. A worker has not been recommended and it has been admitted that he is not suitable for the post. But the ministry seems to have no right to remove him: He has been elected by the collective.

In brief, this aspect of appointment by election has in general been only feebly worked through, the meeting's participants are convinced. But it is weakest of all in that section which is connected with the dissolution of labor relationships. Yu. Tikhomirov and A. Vengerov believe that it is essential to specify more precisely who should act as the initiator of reelections. At present everything is resolved on the basis of the so-called "No 1 List." This is a list of categories of workers whose labor disputes (on questions of dismissals, reprimands, and transfer to other work) are resolved by higher-ranking organs and not via the trade union and court, as for all citizens. The existence of this list on the one hand makes the rights of the labor collective which has decided to rid itself of an inconvenient leader highly ephemeral; and on the other, the leader himself is not protected by law: "Ascribing" to him the errors of all ministry workers is, alas, not such a rarity in our life. Obviously, A. Vengerov says, prompting a solution, categories of workers to whom the principle of appointment by election extends should be excluded from the list.

Of course, many economic leaders who took part in the businesslike meeting so far perceive the prospect of appointment by election as the need to face hostile subordinates and to defend themselves. Hence the polemical keenness of some opinions. In life everything may develop far more calmly. It may -- but not necessarily. The law must be able to resolve any complications democratically.

SUPREME SOVIET VIEWS TAJIK FOOD SUPPLY PROBLEMS

PM251039 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "In the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. On the Work of Tajik SSR Soviets of People's Deputies To Utilize Local Potential To Increase the Production of Food Products, Enhance Their Quality, and Improve Supplies to the Population in the Light of the Demands of the 27th CPSU Congress"]

[Text] As reported earlier, at its session on 17 February this year the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium discussed the work of the Tajik SSR soviets of people's deputies to utilize local potential to increase the production of food products, enhance their quality, and improve supplies to the popultation in the light of the demands of the 27th CPSU Congress.

The resolution that was adopted notes that Tajik SSR soviets of people's deputies, under the leadership of party organizations, have carried out a certain amount of work to ensure the implementation of the Food Program. In 1986, gross agricultural output rose by 7 percent against the average annual level achieved during the 11th 5-Year Plan. The plans for state purchases of the main types of agricultural products and the production of a number of food industry products were fulfilled. At present socialist competition to mark the 70th anniversary of Great October in a worthy fashion is developing in labor collectives.

At the same time, Tajik SSR soviets of people's deputies have not adopted resolute measures to improve the management of the agroindustrial complex in the light of the demands of the 27th party congress and the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum. They are not giving sufficient help to the new management organs in increasing the production of ood products and improving supplies of these products to the population and they are not exacting enough toward the leaders of these organs regarding the state of this work. Agro-industrial committees and associations have underestimated the importance of mobilizing the human factor and of instilling in every worker a truly thrifty attitude to matters.

The production of many types of agricultural and food products is lagging considerably behind the targets of the Food Program and the population growth rate. The production plans for the 12th 5-Year Plan do not make provision for increased per capital consumption of meat and milk. Plan discipline has slackened in the republic agro-industrial complex system. Deliveries of cucurbits, grapes, and dried fruits to the all-union stocks have not been made in full.

The local soviets' efforts to ensure the efficient utilization of agricultural land are inadequate. Insufficient use is made of intensive cotton cultivatiion techniques to release arable land for the cultivation of food and feed crops. Cotton-alfalfa crop rotation is used on only one-third of the land. The experience of leading teams, which achieve yields of 45 quintals of raw cotton per hectare as against the republic average of around 30 quintals per hectare, is not disseminated widely enough. As a result of the violation of agrotechnical standards and cadres' insufficient skill, the requisite returns are not obtained from the application of intensive techniques. The areas where intensive techniques are used produced only 50 percent of the planned quantity of grain last year. Only on one in two hectares of irrigated land have set agricultural crop yields been attained.

Due attention is not paid to the development of livestock raising. [pragraph continues]

Such fundamental problems of the sector as the improvement of the stock herd and its reproduction remain unsolved. Feed production is in a state of neglect. The productivity of natural meadows and pastures is low. Feed expenditure per unit of livestock product exceeds the norm by 50-100 percent. Cattle and hog average daily weight gains have decreased in comparison with the 10th 5-Year Plan. Considerable meat resources are lost because poorly fed livestock is surrended for slaughter. One in three farms obtains milk yields of less than 2,000 kg per cow. The murrain rate is high. The development of fish farming is intolerably slow.

Sufficient use is not made of the potential of the development of subsidiary farms in order to augment the production of food resources; two-thirds of enterprises and organizations have no subsidiary farms. The rural population is given little help to acquire young livestock and poultry.

The Tajik SSR Council of Ministers pays insufficient attention to the efficient utilization of processing industry installations and their accelerated retooling and is not exacting enough toward republic and local soviet and economic organs whose task it is to see to this. Provision has not been made for the comprehensive processing of agriculture produce and the introduction of waste-free technologies. Demands regarding the expansion of the product range and improvement of quality have been relaxed and many products are substandard. The standard of service provided by trade outlets is lagging behind growing demands. Though the population is poorly supplied with retail trade outlets and public catering establishments, the targets to expand these networks are systematically not met.

Consumer Cooperatives' production and procurement work needs serious improvement. Processing industry capacities are augmented too slowly and furthermore are underused. The measures necessary to ensure increased purchases of agricultural products and to expand the network of procurement centers, especially in remote and mountainous areas, have not been adopted. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes are not given the necessary help in exercising their right to market some of their plan and above-plan output themselves. The kolkhoz markets must be improved.

Considerable quantities of food resources are lost during transportation, storage, processing, and marketing. Around 20 percent of the potato, vegetable, and fruit crop fails to reach the consumer. The attention paid to the creation of a modern storage infrastructure and the construction of refrigeration facilities is absolutely insufficient.

Many agro-industrial committees and associations are mastering economic methods of management too slowly and persist in overregulating the activity of farms and enterprises. Forms of labor organization and remuneration which have proved their worth are not widely applied. The targets for reducing the prime cost of the main types of output and the plans for profits are not fulfilled. More than 30 percent of sovkhozes made a loss last year. The standard of preparations at farms for the transition to self-financing and self-recoupment is low. The struggle against mismanagement, overreporting, and misappropriations is not waged resolutely enough.

The work to select, train, and retrain cadres and create the necessary living and working conditions for them is not in line with present-day demands. Turnover among farm leaders is high. There is a shortage of specialists and of skilled workers in the mass trades. The network of vocational and technical colleges and their teaching facilities are not being developed sufficiently and very few young people are sent to these colleges on the basis of sponsorship by kolkhozes and sovkhozes. [paragraph continues]

Effective measures have not been adopted to mechanize heavy manual operations. Sanitary and consumer service facilities are insufficient.

The necessary care is not shown for accelerating the solution of social problems in the countryside. The construction of housing and cultural and consumer service facilities, the area of consumer and other services, and the provision of amenities in population centers are lagging seriously behind.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium instructs the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers, guided by the decisions of the 27th party congress and the directives of the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum, to adopt vigorous measures to eliminate the serious shortcomings noted in this resolution and to improve the style and methods of work by soviets of people's deputies and their ispolkoms to lead the agro-industrial complex.

They are instructed to strive for an accelerated improvement in food supplies to the population by mobilizing existing reserves as much as possible. They are to enhance exactingness toward republic organs of the agro-industrial complex and consumer cooperative organizations regarding the unconditional fulfillment of the plan for deliveries of products to the all-union stocks.

The republic's local soviets of people's deputies and their executive organs are instructed to exercise their powers more actively to improve the organization of food supplies to the population. They must ensure that agro-industrial complex management organs focus their attention on solving key problems in the intensification of production, involve scientific establishments more widely in this work, and disseminate leading experience more actively. They must be more exacting regarding the fulfillment of plan targets and the observance of contract discipline. They must implement specific measures to broaden the range and enhance the quality of food products.

The introduction everywhere of intensive techniques for the cultivation and harvesting of agricultural crops must be better supervised. The leadership of water resources construction must be improved and special attention must be paid to steppiung up work on the reconstruction of land reclamation systems, maintaining irrigated land in proper condition, achieving the planned yields on irrigated land, and ensuring extensive use of water-conserving irrigation methods.

Purposeful efforts must be made to radically improve the situation in livestock raising and to increase livestock productivity. Measures must be adopted to ensure better feed supplies for the livestock sector, greater returns from natural meadows and pastures, an improved quality and thrifty expenditure of feed.

The development and efficient running of enterprise and organization subsidiary farms, citizen's private plots, and collective horticulture and truck gardening must be promoted in every way and order must be established in recordng the number of livestock in the population's possession.

Consumer cooperatives must be given the necessary assistance in improving their procurement and production activity and in strengthening their ties with agro-industrial complex enterprises. the standard of leadership of trade and public catering must be improved and the observance of rules governing the sales of food products must be monitored more closely.

Agro-industrial committees and associations must be encouraged to make wider use of economic methods of management, accelerate the changeover of farms and enterprises to self-recoupment and self-financing, introduce full-scale financial autonomy and the collective contract everywhere, and disseminate widely the experience of family teams and links.

It is necessary to strive for the safekeeping and rational utilization of all means and resources, the elimination of losses, and better organization of accounting and reporting. The role of law enforcement organs and people's control organs, labor collectives, and public organizations in the struggle against mismanagement and waste must be stepped up.

Special attention must be paid to training and retraining cadres and to teaching them to master the new methods of management. Measures must be adopted to expand the network of vocational and technical colleges and to strengthen their base. It is necessary to accelerate the creation of the necessary production and living conditions for workers in the agro-industrial complex and in trade.

Due attention must be paid to expanding the construction of housing and other social area amenities, exactingness regarding the fulfillment of construction plans must be increased, and specific measures to overcome the delays in the commissioning of hospitals, polyclinics, outpatient clinics, clubs, cultural centers, and consumer service facilities must be implemented.

The attention of the Tajik SSR Council of Ministers, the USSR Gosagroprom [State Agro-Industrial Committee], USSR Ministry of Grain Products, USSR Ministry of the Fish Industry, USSR Ministry of Trade, and the Tsentrosoyuz is drawn to the need to adopt additional measures to accelerate the development and retooling of the agricultural product storage and processing infrastructure, the fish industry, trade, and public catering. Soviet organs at local level are instructed to involve industrial enterprises and construction and planning and design organizations more extensively in this work.

The USSR Gosagroprom and the USSR Ministry of Health are instructed, together with union republic councils of ministers, to ensure effective monitoring of the observance of public health legislation in the utilization of fertilizers and plant protection agents and to enhance exactingness toward the competent republic organs for the state of this work.

In view of the fact that the materials of the standing commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the report of the Supreme Soviet Presidium and Tajik SSR Council of Ministers contain questions which come under the jurisdiction of the USSR Government, it is deemed expedient to pass them on to the USSR Council of Ministers for examination and adoption of measures.

The union and autonomous republic supreme soviet presidiums are instructed to step up their supervision of the work of local soviets in improving the leadership of the agro-industrial complex, to increase the soviets' responsibility for the implementation of the Food Program and the comprehensive solution of tasks in increasing the production of agrcultural raw materials and food products and the development of the sociocultural area in the countryside, to encourage the participation of standing commissions and deputy groups and posts in this work, and to develop and support their initiative in identifying and mobilizing all local resources and potential for improving food supplies to the population.

COSMOS-1824 LAUNCHED 26 FEB, FUNCTIONING 'NORMALLY'

LD270820 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0758 GMT 27 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow, 27 Feb (TASS) -- Another artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-1824, was launched in the Soviet Union on February 26, 1987. It carries scientific apparatus for continuing space research.

The satellite has been placed in an orbit with the following parameters: initial period of revolution, 89.7 mins; maximum distance from the surface of the earth, 370 km; minimum distance from the surface of the earth, 177 km; orbital inclination, 67.2 degrees. The apparatus aboard the satellite is working normally.

URALS BRANCH OF ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OPENS

LD062339 Moscow TASS in English 2102 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Text] Sverdlovsk February 6 TASS -- The decision to set up the Urals branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences was adopted at a meeting of the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences held in Sverdlovsk today.

The branch will deal with comprehensive development of the Urals economic region, with technological re-equipment of its industrial potential, development of new methods of mining natural raw materials, development of mineral resources of the north.

The Urals economic district is among the Soviet Union's districts with the biggest industrial potential and the biggest number of researchers. A scientific centre uniting 15 large institutions of the academy functions there. There are 60 higher educational and research institutions and design offices in the area.

The Urals economic region plays an important role in the country's national economy. But minerals in the area are now mined at ever greater depths, in hard of access districts near the Arctic Circle. [sentence as received]

It is only new technologies and materials that can ensure a speedy development of the Urals area which is required by the interests of the entire economy and the plans for the current five-year period and subsequent years outlined by the 27th CPSU Congress.

The Urals branch of the Academy of Sciences will pool the efforts of researchers, will make it possible to resolve in a comprehensive way the economic, social and ecological problems of the development of productive forces of the Urals, said President of the USSR Academy of Sciences Academician Guriy Marchuk who took part in the meeting. It was recently decided to set up a similar branch in the Soviet far east. This is characteristic of the new stage of the activity of the Academy of Sciences, reorganisation in collectives of researchers, drawing young cadres into them, Academician Marchuk said.

FURTHER REPORTAGE OF ARMY, NAVY DAY OBSERVANCE

Akhromeyev on Restructuring

PM202011 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Feb 87 First Edition p 1

[Article by Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, chief of General Staff of the Armed Forces and USSR first deputy minister of defense: "The Glory and Pride of the Soviet People"]

[Text] The USSR Armed Forces are 69 years old on 23 February. The Soviet Army and Navy were created by the Communist Party and V.I. Lenin to defend the socialist fatherland as a military organization of the new socialist type. They embodied all the features of the new society -- the alliance of the working class and laboring peasantry, the friendship of the USSR's peoples, the unity of the Army and the people. History has convincingly demonstrated the advantage of armed forces created on these principles.

During the years of civil war and foreign intervention the Red Army under the leadership of the Communist Party and V.I. Lenin passed the test and fulfilled under incredibly complex conditions the historic task placed upon it -- it routed the combined forces of internal counterrevolution and foreign intervention and defended the gains of Great October.

In winning the victory of the Grest Patriotic War the USSR Armed Forces covered their combat banners with unfading glory. The most important result of the Great Patriotic War for the Communist Party, the Soviet people, and their Armed Forces was the conclusion that it is necessary to fight against war before it begins. For more than 40 years now the struggle against the war danger has been one of the most important tasks of the Soviet people under the leadership of our party.

Under present-day conditions the defense of the socialist fatherland remains a most important military-political task. V.I. Lenin's famous words that any revolution is only worth anything if it knows how to defend itself are as topical today as they were 7 decades ago.

The aggressiveness in imperialism's policy is not declining. In U.S. foreign policy there is a growing reliance on military force and an aspiration to surge forward at any price and solve international problems by the force of arms. And although the U.S. leadership acknowledges verbally that a nuclear war cannot be won, in practice it is striving to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union, primarily through nuclear weapons and outer space, striving to achieve a situation which it can dictate a course of behavior which suits it to the socialist countries. Politicians and strategists in Washington and their NATO bloc allies are deviating increasingly from the positions agreed at the Geneva and Reykjavik summit meetings, accelerating the fulfillment of planned long-term military-technical programs, and striving to undermine the very foundation of possible agreements now and in the future.

Not so long ago the United States demonstratively destroyed the SALT II Treaty with the commissioning of strategic bombers equipped with long-range cruise missiles beyond what is permitted by the treaty. It is accelerating the development [sozdaniye] of new strategic missile means -- Midgetman ICBM's, Trident-2 SLBM's, and long-range cruise missiles of all basing modes. The deployment of MX ICBM's on U.S. territory and medium-range missiles in Western Europe is continuing. Preparations are being made for the siting of new chemical weapons in Europe. [paragraph continues]

An extensive program for the buildup and improvement of general-purpose forces is being implemented.

Particular efforts are being made in the United States to accelerate work on the Star Wars program -- the creation [sozdaniye] of a multitier ABM system for the country and a space-based tier of such a system. With the help of this system the U.S. leadership hopes to gain military superiority, neutralize the Soviet retaliation potential, make the United States invulnerable in a nuclear missile war, and secure for itself the possibility of inflicting a first nuclear strike with impunity.

In accelerating the implementation of this program, some people over the ocean are counting on using the arms race to confront the Soviet Union with insoluble tasks. Those who think like this are forgetting the lessons of history and underestimating our people's potential.

In pursuing a strategic line aimed at accelerating the socioeconomic development of society and strengthening its defense capability the Soviet Union firmly follows a course of creating peace and strengthening international security. The 27th CPSU Congress pointed particularly to the growing significance of this course and formulated the fundamental bases of it, which have now found their practical embodiment in many major Soviet initiatives. They include the broad program for ridding the planet of nuclear and other mass destruction weapons by the end of our century advanced by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on 15 January 1986. The realism of this program became obvious in the course of the Soviet-American meeting in Reykjavik in October 1986, where the Soviet Union's will and readiness to implement it were fully confirmed. The USSR placed on the negotiating table a package of concrete proposals on strategic weapons, medium-range missiles, the ending of nuclear tests, the prevention of militarization of space, and verification [kontrol] questions.

They all proceed from established realities and presuppose mutual military equality at as low a level as possible. "Look at all our proposals," Comrade M.S. Gorbachev noted in his 16 February speech to the participants in the international forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, For the Survival of Humanity." "In them there are no attempts to leave any of our weapons outside the framework of talks. Ours is a simple principle: Everything must be limited and reduced, and in terms of mass destruction weapons matters must be steered toward their destruction. This is our firm line."

The Soviet Union's policy and peace initiatives formulated in the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and Comrade M.S. Gorbachev's 16 February speech reflect new political thinking, new approaches to foreign policy, the defense of the state, and the safeguarding of international security. They are based on the premise that in the modern nuclear-space age the safeguarding of security is increasingly a political task. It cannot be ensured by military-technical means alone, by the creation of even the most powerful offensive or defensive forces, including a "space shield." This task can and must be resolved primarily by political means, by lowering the level of military confrontation, limiting and reducing arms, and strengthening trust and international cooperation.

A Soviet military doctrine -- a system of fundamental views on the essence and prevention of war, military building, the preparation of the country and the Armed Forces to repulse aggression, and methods of waging armed struggle to defend the socialist fatherland -- is being created and developed in accordance with CPSU policy and the principles of the new political thinking. It is based on maintaining the country's defense capability at a strictly necessary level precluding military-strategic superiority on the party of imperialism.

The 27th CPSU Congress conmfirmed the defensive thrust of Soviet military doctrine. It stated to the entire world that the Soviet Union will not be the first to use nuclear weapons. But if nuclear weapons are used against the Soviet Union the response will be immediate and devastating.

The defensive nature of Soviet military doctrine is also demonstrated in the fact that the USSR persistently advocates the maintaining of a balance of military forces at the lowest possible level and the reduction of military potentials to limits which are adequate and necessary for defense while completely excluding nuclear weapons from the sides' arms. The Soviet Union does not lay claim to greater security but will never agree to less security for itself and its allies. Our military doctrine is a doctrine of military balance and equal security for all.

The building of the Armed Forces and provision of new equipment and weapons for them proceeds in accordance with this, as does the implementation of troop and naval force training and the development of military science and military art.

The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government devote unslackening attention to the Armed Forces and display constant concern for strengthening their combat potential, improving their equipment provision, increasing the ideological staunchness, organization, and discipline of the personnel, and educating them in the spirit of loyalty to the Soviet motherland and their patriotic and international duty.

The Army and Navy share the same thoughts as the entire Soviet people. The restructuring being carried out in the country is being actively carried out in the Armed Forces. It is manifested first and foremost in the improvement of cadres' work style, the assertion of efficiency and an objective assessment of achievements, the development of initiative and independence of action, and the enhancement of the exactingness and responsibility of all personnel.

Restructuring is also reflected in the further strengthening of one-man command, the ability to collectively elaborate the most optimum solutions, the commanding officer's reliance on the collective, the enhancement of the role and influence of political organs and party and Komsomol organizations in the Army and Navy, and the prompt introduction into the training process of the latest achievements of scientific and technical progress and Soviet military science.

In accordance with the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum particular attention is currently being devoted to further improving cadre policy in the Soviet Army and Navy and increasing the ideological tempering and professional training of military cadres.

The USSR Armed Forces now possess skilled cadres. More than 76 percent of Army and Navy officers are Communists, and 15 percent are Komsomol members. Over 80 percent of generals, admirals, and officers have higher military and specialized education, and 57 percent are engineers.

But the demands made of the Armed Forces, and particularly their cadres, are growing. restructuring in work with them is now coming to the fore. It presupposes an influx of fresh forces into leadership posts and the arming of them with more profound knowledge, the recommendations made by science, advanced experience, and the ability to look ahead and perceive all the diversity of subordinate troops' lives with the positive and negative phenomena which exist. [paragraph continues]

Particular significance is becoming attached to achieving unity of word and deed, switching efforts in practical organizational work to within units, subdivisions, and ships, and developing initiative and creativity.

Under these conditions new content is being imparted to the demand to make combat training as close as possible to the conditions of real combat reality and training troops and naval forces to resolve tasks in the most complex conditions that could arise in war.

The Soviet Army and Navy received a high assessment at the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum. "The Soviet Armed Forces," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, pointed out, "are also experiencing restructuring. They are reliably safeguarding the people's peaceful labor and the country's security and fulfilling their international duty with honor." This assessment obliges Soviet servicemen to serve their socialist motherland even more selflessly.

Marshal Kulikov Interviewed

PM231141 Moscow TRUD in Russian 22 Feb 87 p 3

[Interview with Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, USSR first deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces, by TRUD editorial office: "Mighty Guardian of Peace; Tomorrow Is Soviet Army and Navy Day" -- date and place unspecified; first paragraph is TRUD introduction]

[Text] Questions from the TRUD editorial office were answered by Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, USSR first deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces.

[TRUD] What in your opinion, Viktor Georgiyevich, constitutes the importance of the Soviet Armed Forces as the guarantor of the peoples' peace and security? Please describe their role in the present-day international situation.

[Kulikov] The 27th CPSU Congress that was held a year ago and the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum made a high assessment of the USSR Armed Forces. It would not be wrong of me to say that this assessment was essentially the result of almost 70 years of development of our Army and Navy. As was stated at the congress, our Armed Forces possess modern arms and hardware and have well trained personnel and command and political cadres who are well trained and selflessly devoted to the people. They carry out their duty worthily in a highly complex and sometimes grim situation. The USSR's defense might is maintained at a level which makes it possible to reliably defend Soviet people's peaceful labor.

Our efforts to strengthen our defense might are dictated by the fact that reactionary imperialist circles are actually preparing for a thermonuclear war in the hope of winning it. How? By achieving military superiority over us. They behave accordingly in the international arena and in building relations with the socialist states.

Why, for instance, has it proved impossible so far to realize the opportunities opened up at the Soviet-U.S. summit in Reykjavik? First and foremost because they run counter to the U.S. and NATO plans to outstrip us in the military sphere and blaze a trail through space to world domination.

The Communist Party and the Soviet Government make a realistic assessment of the level of military danger posed by imperialism. It is great. But it is possible to defend peace and avert a war. To this end we need resolute actions against the arms race and genuine disarmament. The foreign policy activity of the CPSU and the Soviet state are subordinated to solving this task.

Unfortunately, the voice of reason does not reach everyone. We propose peace, others propose war to us. That is why we have been forced to bolster the potential of our diplomacy with the potential of the Armed Forces. Their high combat might is a factor of immense importance. They restrain the imperialists from wanting to test our strength or checking our allies' breaking point.

[TRUD] Last June the Warsaw Pact states proposed comprehensive and deep cuts in armed forces and conventional arms in Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals. What prompted this step and what was the NATO countries' reaction to it?

[Kulikov] Indeed, at the Budapest Conference (June 1985) of the Political Consultative Committee the fraternal countries proposed 25-percent cuts in NATO and Warsaw Pact Armed Forces in the next few years. Substantial reductions in all components of the European states' ground forces and tactical strike aviation and in the corresponding U.S. and Canadian forces sited in Europe were planned. Nuclear (operational-tactical) arms with a range of up to 1,000 km would also be cut at the same time as conventional arms. As a result of phased actions the opposing groupings of armed forces in Europe would be reduced by more than 1 million men by the start of the nineties.

We embarked on this course because Europe is currently the most explosive spot on earth. It is excessively laden with nuclear and other arms. The European Continent -- the epicenter of two world wars -- can no longer be a battlefield without running a risk of vanishing forever in the crater of a thermonuclear catastrophe. Stopping the slide into that crater was the aim of our proposal.

At the same time, figuratively speaking, the proposal destroys the foundations of the "obstacles" which the West places in the way of nuclear disarmament. Voices can be heard in NATO capitals in support of nuclear weapons. They see nuclear weapons as a "reliable" way of defending the West from the Warsaw Pact's "overwhelming conventional forces." If the Americans took their nuclear missiles away from West Europe, it is claimed, Soviet tanks would reach the Rhine and the Seine within 48 hours.

But is that so? Does Europe need nuclear weapons so much? The facts say no. There is balance in conventional arms in Europe. If we look at total manpower and the number of combat-ready divisions and antitank means the advantage clearly lies with the NATO Allied Armed Forces. There is approximate equality in terms of the amount of artillery and armor. The Warsaw Pact has slightly more tactical aircraft -- if we include air defense aircraft. However, if we look at the sides' combat potential as a whole, taking into account quantitative and qualitative indicators, military parity will be comfirmed.

There is obvious equilibrium. But its level is too high. Many conventional weapons are now approaching mass destruction means in terms of their combat characteristics. We have proposed defusing the atmosphere of fear prevailing in Europe. But 6 months after the Budapest appeal a proposal was made to us that we enter talks on the imaginary "imbalance" in the side's military potentials -- that is, join in protracted and, as experience shows, fruitless discussion over figures.

[TRUD] So we are forced to take retaliatory measures and strengthen the Armed Forces?

[Kulikov] Unfortunately, there is no other way as yet. We are objectively faced with the need to provide a fitting response to imperialism's dangerous aspirations. V.I. Lenin stressed that "nothing will hamper them except a strengthening of defense capability." A number of major measures are being taken to that end. One of the most important is the strengthening of the Soviet Armed Forces' combat potential.

The material basis of the combat might of the Army and Navy is their level of technical equipment. This corresponds to present-day demands in all branches of the Armed Forces -- the Strategic Missile Forces, the Ground Forces, the Air Force, the Air Defense Forces, and the Navy. But the West -- and the United States in particular -- is creating new and more destructive weapons and equipment. For instance, the MX, Midgetman, and Trident 2 missiles, the B-1B and Stealth missile platforms, and highly accurate guided weapons. Furthermore, traditional weapons are being improved. So the USSR is doing everything to ensure that its Army and Navy continue to have the most modern combat hardware and weapons at their disposal.

But this is just one side of the coin. Equipment is only effective when it is in skillful hands. In the hands of servicemen who are ideologically tempered, excellently trained, and psychologically steadfast. Almost 80 percent of draftees have higher or secondary education. The remainder are educated to not less than grade eight. Some 70 percent of officers have higher military or specialized military education.

Armed Forces personnel respond to the concern of the party and people by augmenting their combat skills and worthily carrying out their patriotic and international duty. The initiators of socialist competition are among the socialist competition front-rankers in the Army and Navy. They are the personnel of the units and the nuclear submarine commanded by Lieutenant Colonel N. Ulyanov, Guards Lieutenant Colonel Yu Pakhomov, Guards Lieutenant Colonel V. Soshko, Guards Colonel A. Labkovskiy, and Captain 1st Class V. Nikolayevskiy.

Soviet servicemen made a considerable contribution to taming the atom that caused so much trouble at Chernobyl. More than 40 officers and men have been awarded the lofty title of Hero of the Soviet Union for their feats on Afghan soil, and many have been awarded orders and medals.

[TRUD] You, Comrade Marshal, are also a frontline soldier. So it is doubly interesting to know your opinion about what young people get out of military service and what demands it places on them.

[Kulikov] Yes, you are right. I was not yet 20 and a platoon commander when the war started. I participated in battles on the Southwest Front. Subsequently I fought on the Kalinin, 1st Baltic, and 2d Belorussian Fronts. I ended the war as chief of staff of a guards heavy self-propelled artillery brigade. And everywhere I served I saw how our servicemen embodied their mighty moral force -- the force of defenders of socialism -- in their feats and glory. I see in today's soldiers the same qualities that allowed us to win the toughest of wars.

I realize that these qualities do not come automatically. They are fostered by our entire way of life, and primarily by the memory of those who defended their native soil. This memory is alive in each home and each family. And it is probably there that Soviet people learn the most important lessons of patriotism.

Schools, vocational and technical colleges, technical colleges, and VUZ's are the next level. From them the youngsters take their first step into adult life -- they become soldiers. The motherland gives them weapons, assigns to them a lofty responsibility for socialism's fate, and instructs them to be unstinting in defending our historic gains.

At the same time it must also be said that a modern war, if unleashed by the imperialists, will place incomparably higher demands on servicemen than all previous wars. The expenditure of spiritual and physical strength will grow immeasurable. The importance of skillful and resolute actions under conditions of the use of mass destruction weapons by the enemy, rigid time limits, and a rapidly changing situation will increase.

Of course, after the well known CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution on further improving young people's preparation for military service, this preparation has on the whole reached a higher level. But unfortunately not in everything. Young people who are politically naive, careless in their assessment of the imperialist military threat, and poorly prepared educationally, morally, psychologically, and physically still arrive at military collectives.

We know that our people love their Armed Forces and are concerned about them in every possible way. For their part Soviet servicemen profoundly recognize their duty to the people. The Army and Navy will continue to reliably safeguard their peaceful labor and the gains of Great October.

BOGACHEV ON U.S. BASES IN W. EUROPE, ASIA

LD171752 Moscow TASS in English 1729 GMT 17 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 17 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

Washington sees the network of its military bases in Western Europe and Asia not only as a means of bringing pressure to bear on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries but also as a lever for projecting U.S. political, economic and military interests in the countries included in the so-called "zone of U.S. vital interests".

Some of the specific tasks of American military presence outside the national boundaries of the United States have changed from time to time, depending on the particular strategic concepts adopted by the Pentagon.

But the prime mission of the U.S. military bases overseas has always been to ensure that, if the United States starts a war, the damage to the territory of the aggressor (that is the U.S. itself) will be only minimal and that the brunt of the cost of Washington's military adventures will be borne by European and Asian nations.

The "Star Wars" program and the concept for deploying U.S. nuclear arms far from U.S. territory form the basis of the Pentagon's military strategy. The ominous meaning of the present U.S. Administration's military preparations boils down to "an ABM shield" for the United States and "a limited nuclear war" for Europe and Asia.

Apart from everything else, the U.S. allies hosting American military bases should, as the Pentagon sees it, perform the role of a lightning conductor absorbing part of the retaliatory blow.

U.S. military presence in Europe has certainly made it easier for Washington to get its medium-range nuclear missiles installed in the territories of other NATO countries.

After agreeing, contrary to their national security interests, to accept American Pershing and Cruise missile deployments in their territories, European NATO countries have taken also a second fateful step, by giving their consent to cooperate with the U.S. Administration in the Star Wars effort.

The hopes to perpetrate aggression with impunity reflect the stone-age mentality which is, alas, characteristic of Washington strategy-makers.

These hopes to survive a nuclear war by exposing one's allies to the blow and thus escaping it oneself are equally illusory and dangerous. They are dangerous not only for the victim of the aggression but also to the aggressor himself.

The issue of dismantling foreign military bases was first raised by the members of the socialist community years ago but it has lost none of its relevance.

A positive resolution of this issue would constitute an important step to stronger peace and stability on earth.